GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

SEPTEMBER 13, 2005

+ + + + +

The Board convened in the Former Council Chamber, First Floor, 441 $4^{\rm th}$ Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS Chairperson
RUTHANNE G. MILLER Vice Chairperson
CURTIS L. ETHERLY, JR. Board Member
JOHN A. MANN II Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL MITTEN Chairperson

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY

BEVERLY BAILEY

JOHN NYARKU

TRACEY W. ROSE

Secretary

Zoning Specialist

Senior Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ. MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN MOORE
MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the public meeting held on September 13, 2005.

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER: Geoffrey Griffis	. 4
HANNAH REISMAN APPLICATION NO. 17306	. 8
VOTE TO APPROVE APPLICATION	. 10
PHILLIPS PARK, LLC APPLICATION NO. 17276	. 10
VOTE TO APPROVE APPLICATION	. 13
VOTE TO DENY APPLICATION	. 22
ST. ALBAN'S SCHOOL ON BEHALF OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CATHEDRAL FOUNDATION OF D.C.	
<u>APPLICATION NO. 17320</u>	. 23
VOTE TO APPROVE APPLICATION WITH CONDITIONS	167
PRESIDENT AND DIRECTORS OF GEORGETOWN COLLEGE APPLICATION NO. 16566-F	170
PAUL BASKEN AND JOSH MEYER APPLICATION NO. 17411	173
OPENING REMARKS - AFTERNOON SESSION	180
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	185
MARIO ALAS AND HAYDEE VANEGAS APPLICATION NO. 17274 ANC-4B	185
VOTE TO DENY THE MOTION TO CONTINUE	188
VOTE TO DISMISS	189
JOSEPH STETTINIUS	100
APPLICATION NO. 17355 ANC-2E	192
VOTE TO DENY THE MOTION TO DISMISS OR POSTPONE	204

	4
MICHAEL TAYLOR APPLICATION NO. 17349	292
VOTE TO DENY THE MOTION TO DISMISS	306
ADJOURN Geoffrey Griffis	317

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

10:07 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: A very good morning to everyone and welcome back after our August recess it should be obvious to everyone we're in a different location. So, we'll probably have quite a bit of technical changes and accommodations, but we do appreciate everyone living through the renovations.

If you went upstairs, you'll see that there are all new offices proposed and on their way for the Office of Zoning which will accommodate, I think, quite well the public's participation in this process, but do accept our apologies to all visitors for hearings and the meeting today and we certainly hope that everyone found this room easily enough and as I said off the record, please find those wandering aimlessly that should be in here and direct them to the right place if we do not do that.

Let me just do a couple of quick housekeeping items. First of all, if -- let me just state that the same rules apply as upstairs in our hearing room. We ask that people not have food or drinks in this room.

Anything that you do bring into this room, we would ask that you please take them with you.

1 There are trash receptacles that are available for 2 If you do not need to take what you brought in home with you, please dispose of it yourself. 3 4 We are not being broadcast on the web down 5 in this room, but we are being recorded, of course, officially by the court reporter and I will state that 6 again in -- in the official openings. 7 8 With that, let me call the 13th of September of 2005 public meeting of the Board of 9 Zoning Adjustment to order. 10 11 My name is Geoff Griffis, Chairperson. 12 Joining me today is the Vice Chair Ms. Miller and also our esteem colleague Mr. Etherly. 13 14 Representing the National Capital Planning 15 Commission with us is Mr. Mann and we will in our public meeting have differing participations by the 16 Zoning Commissioners as the case warrants. 17 Copies of today's agenda are available for 18 19 I do believe they're on the table where you you. 20 entered into the hearing room. You can pick those up. 21 I am going to be juggling the schedule this morning a 22 little bit and let me get right to that. First, I would like to hear 17306 which is 23 24 the first case on the agenda. 25 Second, we will go to 17276 which is

Phillips Park. There are two motions in that and we will take that up second on our agenda.

Third, we will move into 17320 which is that application of the St. Alban's School.

We will then take a short break, return for the fourth and fifth cases for decision this morning. That being 16566-F Georgetown University and 17411 which is a motion to dismiss an appeal.

I believe everyone present is well aware of our procedures in the public meetings, but let me just restate the fact that I would ask them to turn off their cell phones and beepers so that we don't have disruption of our deliberation. We obviously will not be hearing testimony in the cases that I've indicated as first three in the morning, but this will be the time for you to listen to us review the case and deliberate it -- deliberate on it and come to a decision.

With that, let me say a very good morning to Ms. Bailey who's with the Office of Zoning and also Mr. Moy who is on my left. Mr. Nyarku, very far left, is also with the Office of Zoning who will be attending to the Board. The Office of Attorney General is represented.

And let us move on and call the first case

for decision this morning.

SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir, good morning,
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board.

The first case is a motion for a minor modification of approved plans pursuant to -- which was to application number 17306 of Hannah Reisman, pursuant to 11 DCMR 1202 and 3104.1, for a special exception under Section 223 to allow an addition to an existing single-family dwelling not meeting the rear yard requirements, Section 404, in the CAP/R-4 District at premises 227 C Street, S.E. That's in square 763, lot 24.

On April 19th, 2005, the Board completed public testimony on the application and approved it by a bench decision. A summary order was issued on the same day. A filing for a motion for the modification was on June 2nd, 2005 and is in your case package identified as Exhibit 31.

Finally, Staff would like to also add that the ANC, ANC-6B, in a letter dated June 28, 2005, was filed into the record, that's Exhibit Number 33, where the ANC indicated in their letter that the -- that given the -- the -- the modification not warranting a review by the full ANC Commission and that completes the Staff's briefing, Mr. Chairman.

Excellent. 1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank 2 you very much, Mr. Moy, and let me also step back a second and say I neglected to wish a very good morning 3 4 to Ms. Rose who's also with the Office of Zoning and 5 with us today. Mr. Moy, thank you. Excellent review of 6 where we are with the motion for minor modification in 7 17306. 8 I think that with such a small scope and 9 clearly understood by the Board that we ought to start 10 11 our deliberation under a motion and I would move 12 approval of the minor modification that approves the plans as submitted in the record at this time and ask 13 14 for a second. 15 MEMBER MANN: Second. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you, Mr. Mann. 17 I think we can look easily to Exhibit Number 31 in the record, also was provided the -- the prior and I know 18 19 we looked at the past record. These are certainly 20 minor and don't have any impact that would change my 21 deliberation the original assessment or on 22 In fact, this is removing some of those application. 23 elements of which were critical to the 223 special

And I'll open it up to others.

exception.

24

1	If there is no further comment on that, we
2	do have a motion before us. It has been seconded. I
3	would ask for all those in favor signify by saying
4	aye.
5	(Ayes.)
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Opposed? Why don't
7	we record the vote?
8	SECRETARY MOY: Staff would record the
9	vote on the motion of the Chair to approve the motion
LO	for a minor modification, seconded by Mr. Mann. Also
L1	in support of the of the motion is Ms. Miller.
L2	With a vote of 3 to 0 to 1, no Zoning 3 to 0 to 1.
L3	Mr. Etherly not participating on the case.
L4	We do have, Mr. Chair, a absentee ballot
L5	submitted from Mr. Jeffries who who did participate
L6	on the case and his vote is to grant the motion for a
L7	modification.
L8	Therefore, it would give a final vote of
L9	4 to 0 to 1.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank
21	you very much, Mr. Moy.
22	Why don't we move on then to the second
23	case?
24	SECRETARY MOY: The second case has to do
25	with application number 17276 of Dhilling Dark I.I.C.

1 which that application was pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 2 for a special exception from Section 2516 of the 3 Zoning Regulations to allow the construction of a 4 theoretical lot subdivision for single-family homes in 5 the R-1-A zone district at 2101 Foxhall Road, N.W. in square 1346, lot 822. 6 7 We have two motions before the Board. first motion which you may want to take up second, Mr. 8 Chair, is a motion for reconsideration pursuant to 9 10 Section 3126 and a motion requesting 11 correction to the final order. The motion for reconsideration was filed 12 by the Friends of Whitehaven, a party in -- in the 13 14 opposition, and that is identified in your case 15 records -- case folders as Exhibit 71. There is a filing in opposition to this 16 motion by the -- by the applicant and that 17 identified in your case folders as Exhibit 72 and that 18 19 was filed on August 12th, 2005. 20 Finally, we have a -- as I said earlier, 21 a motion requesting a minor correction to the final 22 order and that is identified as Exhibit 70 dated 23 August 2nd, 2005 and I'll -- I'll stop there, Mr. Chairman. 24

GRIFFIS:

CHAIRPERSON

25

Okay.

Whoa.

1 Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Moy. 2 What I'd like to do, Board Members, 3 take up the first -- the second motion first. 4 would be the motion requesting a minor correction of 5 the final order and I think it is well briefed in the last submission. It is a minor correction to the 6 7 written order. I do note in the August 2 submission, 8 Exhibit -- our Exhibit Number 70, that the -- the --9 the stated section is 2516.6C and, you know, quite 10 11 frankly, I'm not sure if I have the current regs, but 12 it seems to me it's 2516.B that is the -- indicating the -- the dimensional requirements of 25 feet width. 13 14 C goes to the turning radius of 60 feet, but I think we're all understood of exactly what 15 is being corrected in this and if not, we bring that to light. 16 17 Let me open it up to any comments initially from Board Members if there are any. 18 19 If there are no initial statements from 20 Board, I would suggest the that we continue 21 deliberation under a motion. 22 would move approval of the correction to the final order as is indicated and 23 stated in submission Exhibit 70. 24 25 Seconded, Mr. Chair. MEMBER ETHERLY:

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much, 2 Mr. Etherly. 3 Let's move ahead. It seemed to be very 4 clearly laid out the fact of -- based on the -- the 5 record, some of the -- the testimony and also on the draft order that was submitted to the Board. 6 7 dimensional requirements shifted around a little bit 8 as to proposed and then what was actually required and 9 -- and melded into a statement that was not exactly clear. This will hopefully and eventually bring some 10 clarity to -- to our order. 11 12 Let me open up to any other deliberative If they're not, then we do have a motion 13 14 before us. It's been seconded and ask for all those 15 in favor signify by saying aye. 16 (Ayes.) 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed? Very well. 18 Mr. Moy. SECRETARY MOY: Staff would record the --19 20 the vote as 4 to 0 to -- 4 to 0 to 0 on the motion by 21 the Chair to approve the minor correction to the final 22 Seconded by Mr. Etherly. Also in support of order. 23 the motion, Ms. Miller and Mr. Mann. We have an 24 absentee ballot from Mr. Parsons who participated on 25 the case and he has voted to -- to -- to also grant

the minor -- minor correction to the final order which 1 2 will give a final vote of 5 to 0 to 0. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank 4 you, Mr. Moy. 5 Let's move ahead then to the second motion before us. There are two elements involved in that 6 7 and generally stated they are first -- well, first of 8 all, it's а motion for reconsideration 9 reconsideration of our decision in the hearing itself. The two elements are the fact that -- that 10 we erred in a finding of fact that stated that there 11 were over three acres of wetlands that were non-12 natural or were essentially artificial and the second 13 14 element in this motion is some concern of the elements that were stricken from the record based on a witness 15 presented and that is Julie Moore and based on what 16 17 was what was not taken into consideration ordeliberation and was, therefore, reflected in the 18 19 order. 20 Taking both of those, let me open it up. 21 Let's start with however the Board wants to take 22 I'll hear comments. Ms. Miller. those. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I'll just 24 set the stage in that our standards for

reconsideration are -- our standards are in our regs,

1 3126.4. It says that -- that we can consider a motion 2 for reconsideration where it's shown that there's 3 something clearly erroneous in our decision and then 4 if the party is seeking a rehearing, they need to show 5 that -- that new evidence could not have been reasonably presented at the original hearing. 6 7 So, taking, I guess, the first issue about that we made a mistake with respect to the finding 8 9 that are three acres of non-natural wetlands, I don't think that -- I don't see in the record that -- that 10 we've made a mistake and the party, I don't think, 11 made a good case on the record that -- that we had and 12 I think that the record is supported by substantial 13 14 evidence. 15 So, then we get to the question of whether there should be a rehearing and again, I don't see 16 that this party has made a showing that they couldn't 17 have reasonably presented evidence on this issue at 18 19 the hearing that they want to present now. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I absolutely 21 agree in terms of a test of what it would take to open 22 up the record or actually reconsider this. 23 I think there may -- I -- I would concede 24 the fact that in my mind that perhaps there could be

some misunderstanding of the amount of acreage that we

put in a finding, but I think it is read in full with the findings of fact and as to our decision, it was very clear and it was clear in my mind. I think it was clear in the Board's decision that we understood that there were some natural and -- and some non-natural.

Whether we made a mistake of actually putting square footages or acreage numbers on it, I -- I don't -- I'm not going to -- to determine, but I don't think that it's a critical failing of our hearing or deliberation or certainly of the issuance of the order and I don't think it rises as -- as Ms. Miller has said beyond the threshold of what we could take up in terms of the motion for reconsideration in granting it.

Ms. Miller.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to add also that I believe that we did rely on -- on testimony from a Department of Health representative and also that -- that this issue regarding the protection of the wetlands will be addressed by the Department of Health at the time of the issuance of permits. So, I -- I don't think that -- that what we said is the last word on -- on that issue.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent.

1 Excellent. And Ι think the submission by the 2 applicant states that very well. 3 In fact, going to that issue, there was 4 substantial, as you've indicated, substantial factual 5 evidence presented and testimony presented on it and I think we heavily relied on that in terms of our 6 7 deliberation both from the surrounding parties and 8 participants and also the applicant. 9 Very well. Is there anything else on that first element? 10 Then we can move on to the second. The 11 12 Friends are obviously requesting that the Board accept all the information and documents filed on March 28th 13 14 and that was pertaining to the issues of wetland protection and it went directly to the declaration of 15 16 Julie Moore. I would start out first of all saying --17 again reiterating what Ms. Miller said in terms of the 18 19 threshold of what it would take for us to accept a motion for reconsideration whether we had made an 20 21 error in our deliberation or hearings or that there 22 was evidence that is now available that could not have 23 been presented at the hearing. 24 First of all, Ms. Moore did personally

The follow-up written submission

testify.

accepted by the Board except for that information that was new.

There was certainly no -- no opportunity. There was certainly no indication or evidence at this point that there was not an available time or resource to have heard any of that in the hearing and quite frankly, I think we did a substantial and more than sufficient job in addressing that when we removed it from the record.

Now, clearly, we had the filing not all of which was removed from the record, but parts of which were and I think it was -- it was very clear in the Board's point and I think it adequately reflects in our order.

Let me open it up to others. Ms. Miller.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, I think that what this Board was doing was following its regulation 3121.5 which deals with when the record is closed and -- and it says that the record shall be closed following the public hearing except that the record may be kept open for a stated period for the receipt of specific exhibits, information or legal briefs as may be directed by the presiding officer.

And my recollection in this case is that the record was closed at the end of the hearing except

1 for certain specified items including findings of fact 2 and conclusions of law and that we accepted their 3 findings of fact and conclusions of law, but struck in consideration new 4 evidence because it was 5 submitted after the record was closed. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Excellently 7 said. I -- I -- I absolutely agree and I think 8 9 it can be adequately said that the Board hasn't in 10 both of these elements committed any irreversible error on -- on striking the action that 11 we did strike, the declarations. Really more, I think 12 as I said before we discussed it. We deliberated on 13 14 it and we decided at that point and this seems to be 15 revisiting the same issue again. There it is. 16 Anything else? Comments? 17 Very well. I would move now the motion for reconsiderations as stated and ask for a second. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much, 20 21 Ms. Miller. Further deliberations, comments? 22 Good. I think it's been well said that -that the threshold of -- of which we could or would 23 24 approve a motion for reconsideration have not been met 25 and oh, indeed.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Chairman, 2 Mr. Parsons is -- is -- was not able to be with us today and I believe he submitted something 3 4 perhaps Mr. Moy could read into the record with 5 respect to his position on this case. Yes, thank you, Ms. --6 SECRETARY MOY: 7 Vice Chairperson. Mr. Parsons did submit an absentee ballot 8 The comments read as follows: 9 with comments. 10 BZA has consistently relied upon the Department of 11 Health to review and stipulate additional 12 environmental protection of waters of the District of Columbia as the Board of Health determines appropriate 13 14 and necessary at the time of consideration and 15 issuance of permits for ultimate construction of BZA approved development. The protection of natural water 16 flows that may exist in the vicinity of the referenced 17 three acre area will be evaluated at the time any --18 19 any clearing or construction permits are applied for. 20 The BZA appropriately relied upon the applicable 21 District agencies to follow their legally required 22 responsibilities." 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Comments? Very 24 well. Thank you, Mr. Moy. 25 I tend to absolutely agree with the last

sentence in that paragraph and that is, of course, we do rely on the jurisdiction and authority of other agencies to do which -- to enforce or review what is with jurisdiction.

I don't necessary agree with the first board statement that we rely on the Department of Health, but I don't want to get into the details of that. I think the point as I understand what Mr. Parsons narrative has just indicated is the fact that there are other regulatory agencies that go substantively into issues.

Now, I would also say that as I agree with that so did the applicant in Exhibit Number 72 and spent some time on -- on addressing that issue of -- of whether -- what line the Board walks to before it crosses over into other jurisdictions and -- and cited, in fact, a court case and has indicated that in that case we did, in fact, act appropriately and in this case, we would also and have in issuing our decision and order.

Very well. Is there anything else then?

To summarize, I think we can look to the conclusion as submitted in Exhibit 72 which states that the Friends of the Whitehaven have failed to

proffer any new evidence that could have -- could not have been presented at the hearing and I think that is the opinion of the Board.

The Board's decision was also based on substantive evidence in the administrative record and require no further clarification. I think, in fact, we went through substantial and it shows in our order and our own deliberation briefly this morning, but certainly, on the full deliberation and I think that — we should as we have the motion before us to deny the motion for reconsideration, I think we should, in fact, look to rely on our order as issued with the correction that we've made this morning.

Final comments? If there are no other comments on that, then we do have a motion before us.

It's been seconded. Ask for all those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed? Very well. Mr. Moy.

SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir, the Staff would record the vote on the motion of the Chair, the motion to deny the motion for reconsideration, seconded by Ms. Miller. Also in support of the motion is Mr. Mann and Mr. Etherly which is a vote of 4 to 0 to 1. We do

1 have an absentee ballot from Mr. Parsons who 2 participated on the case and his vote is to deny the 3 motion for reconsideration which then would give --4 give -- would give a final vote of 5 to 0 to 0. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Ooh. Boy, I can't Thank you, Mr. Moy. 6 hit that. 7 Then why don't we move on to the next case in the morning which we have changed the schedule 8 9 briefly, but let's call application 17320. SECRETARY MOY: 10 Yes, sir. Application 11 number 17320 of St. Alban's Church -- School on behalf 12 of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of D.C. pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for a special 13 14 exception to permit additional facilities including 15 renovation of athletic fields and related structures and construction of a performing arts center serving 16 a private school under Section 206 in the R-1-B 17 District at premises 3101 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. 18 19 That's in square 1944, lot 25. 20 On July 26, 2005, the Board completed 21 public testimony on the application and requested 22 additional information from the applicant, ANC-3C and 23 the Office of Planning in the form of a supplemental 24 report.

The office has received the following from

1 the applicant on August 2nd, 2005 and that is 2 identified in your case folders as Exhibit 47. 3 The office has also received filings from 4 the District Department of Transportation and the 5 Office of Planning and they are identified -- these documents are identified as Exhibit 6 48 50 7 respectively. 8 The office -- let me -- let me rephrase 9 that, sir. Staff has received filings from DDOT, Office of Planning. Yes, Exhibit 48 and Exhibit 50. 10 Also, on August 26, the Staff Office has 11 12 supplemental report received a response to the submitted by OP and DDOT and that's in your case 13 14 folders identified as Exhibit 51. 15 Also, although not requested by the Board, DDOT filed on September 6th, 2005 a memorandum 16 17 detailing the outcome of a meeting that Staff had had with the applicant, ANC-3C and that is identified as 18 19 -- as Exhibit 52. The office has also received for the 20 21 record proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law 22 from ANC-3C and the applicant and these documents are 23 identified in your case folders as Exhibit 53 and 54 24 respectively. 25 will conclude the Staff's And that

briefing, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good timing, Mr. Moy. Let us as she get's acclimated welcome Ms. Mitten who is a participant on this case. As Ms. Mitten is aware, we've just the case, application 17320 and we asked Mr. Moy to speak slowly while you got your seat.

So, we are ready to proceed with this, Board Members. Let's open it up. We do have the last submission. Mr. Moy's gone through the litany of that which we had requested and that which is in the record at this point.

I will open it up to Board Members to go through a deliberation and also to address specifically if we are moving in the direction of approval, the specific conditions that will be attached to any order of approval.

Let me generally state that I was as I said in the hearing impressed with the amount of work from the design perspective that had gone into the -- the plan in terms of redoing some of the edges and the -- and the -- and the fields and really balancing that of the views from the street, from the public's perspective, but also in terms of the experience on site.

I -- it is an -- it is an important aspect, but not the most critical aspect of our own deliberations under 206, but all those elements obviously touched those aspects that are critical to us and that is, did any of these elements, massings, the placements, the edging, did they create any objectionable conditions be it noise, traffic or number of students or any other objectionable conditions.

We're well aware of the details and the facts and the Board has spent a lot of time going through this. So, let me open it up to others for statements or get right into the specifics.

Mr. Mann, thank you.

MEMBER MANN: I would just to follow up on that make a general comment that I think that we saw lot of design elements incorporated into this project that were specifically or that specifically into consideration potential -- potential conditions that could occur like excessive noise or parking the buildings issues and Ι think recreational fields and whatnot were perhaps cited in a way that was trying to deal with those issues before they became issues.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I absolutely

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

agree and -- and actually, I think a critical point of that is we'll get into some of the noise projection from the athletic activities and then the -- the -- the fans and the crowds that might be there and -- and -- and I would go further.

What you're saying is that -- when I reviewed the plans and the testimony presented, there was a substantial amount of consideration of using one, the existing grading and -- and obviously, athletic fields are flat surfaces, but they're on different levels based on the existing grading that happens on the -- and I'll call it the campus.

Also, as -- as I saw it and as some of the testimony went to, that design elements went to opening up actual vistas or views from the street and from the site, so, as you were participating or as you were walking by. All of which I think lend to the -- as you were saying, Mr. Mann, the detail of how this was to impact the surrounding around. So, that does go directly to 206. Good.

Others? Yes, Ms. Miller.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to note that we're looking at the standard set forth in 206 and 206 as written, looks like it generally relates to the location of a school and the school has

been here for a long time, but I know this Board has applied this to any development of new buildings, et cetera on the property and that's what we'll be looking at here and there are -- there are three different buildings here. One is renovating upper school and extending a new wing. One is modifying fields and one is a new art center.

So, there are three different things that we will be looking at and I think when we look at that to see if there are adverse impacts, we should be -- we look at one, are there -- are there adverse impacts now and then are there -- is there a case that they're likely to be adverse impacts from these changes and also, I -- I just want to say that the -- the world that we're looking in it I think we -- we have our regulations and then we also have the Court of Appeals cases which in general talk about a reasonable accommodation between schools and neighborhoods. So, that the legitimate interests of either one are not interfered with.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Others?

Very well. Let's go into then the -- the specifics of the case findings as they relate to any of the issues under 206. Ms. Mitten.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Is it your intent to

1	go through the proffered conditions one by one or how
2	do you how do you want us to put issues on the
3	table?
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I was open to
5	suggestions, but absolutely, I think that's what we
6	usually do and I think that frames it very well. So,
7	we can start with that.
8	If there are no if no one wants to
9	highlight a a finding of fact, but have those facts
10	come out of the review of the conditions? I think
11	that's appropriate to move ahead in that fashion at
12	this point.
13	Yes, Ms. Miller.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Then I I
15	I would guess then that we would tie that analysis to
16	206.2 or 206.3.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Here I was going to
20	let you all so, but I can certainly show you exactly
21	where to go on this one.
22	Mr. Etherly, did you have a comment,
23	question?
24	MEMBER ETHERLY: No, I was I was going
25	to inquire, Mr. Chair, as to whether or not it would

1 simply be appropriate perhaps for us to operate under 2 a motion which would then lead us to the condition discussion. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I like that. 4 5 Yes, absolutely. MEMBER ETHERLY: If -- if that will be 6 7 appropriate at this time, Mr. Chair, it would -- it 8 would be my motion to move approval of application 9 number 17320 of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation on behalf of St. Alban's School pursuant to 10 11 DCMR 3104 for a special exception under Section 206 11 to allow additions to an existing private school in 12 the R-1-B District at premises 3101 Wisconsin Avenue 13 14 with conditions to be discussed shortly and agreed to 15 by a majority of the Board. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. I would 16 17 second the motion. Let's move ahead then. Mr. Etherly, would you like to take that 18 19 charge or would you like me to move the Board to --20 MEMBER ETHERLY: I'll just -- I'll offer a starting point, Mr. Chair. 21 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. 23 MEMBER ETHERLY: As -- as you've already 24 indicated, I think as other Board's -- other Board 25 Members have spoken to, there has been a tremendous

amount of work that's been put in to this particular application by all of the parties involved inclusive of, of course, the applicant and the ANC and I think that that work has -- has -- has been herculean to say the least, but has resulted in -- in -- in a tremendous amount of progress that oftentimes we don't see in cases that involve our educational institutions.

So, I'm -- I'm -- I've been very pleased with that and I think we have a very good foundation to start. From clearly as has been indicated in some of the submittals, we do have some -- some areas where there are -- there are objections or shall we say differences in opinion between the applicant, the ANC and other affected members of the community. So, I look forward to that conversation as -- as we ensue.

As -- as we look to I believe it was Exhibit Number 54, Mr. Chair, there were a number of conditions identified by the applicant as being -- as being a cause for concern in -- in their review of the ANC's list and I will perhaps offer that as -- as -- as a starting point unless other members have very specific issues.

But, I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ -- I will just note for the benefit of my members as I reviewed that particular submittal,

I found most of the -- most of the arguments of the applicant to be somewhat reasonable with respect to some of the concerns that they had. In particular, I know that -- that there -- there are questions about programming, regarding the use of the parking garage and in particular as it relates to the performing arts center and I will definitely look forward to some discussion on how the Board may want to approach and deal with that particular issue. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. MEMBER ETHERLY: I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you and I think that you're absolutely right that they have -the applicant has addressed some of the motions. Let's state fully in case there is any disagreement to some of the base facts. Ms. Miller mentioned the elements of which we're reviewing this. 206 is an interesting point. It does look to and speak directly to the establishment and here we have over time taken it to look at continuing review and that's just what it has evolved into in terms of private schools. This school is proposing to maintain its current enrollment. They do have a goal of students

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and they have proffered a maximum of 579 students.

We do have both OP and DDOT recommending approval of the application. They both came in with some conditions of which we can look to also in our -- in our own deliberation. I know we've reviewed and digested substantially all of those.

As was laid out by Ms. Miller, we were looking at the -- the wing extension, the performing arts and the reconfiguration of the athletic fields. Of course, those spin off in 206, all of those aspects that are traditional in looking at private schools and that is the parking impact, the noise impact. The utilization impact is somewhat specific to this piece.

I would ask then that we go through and look to conditions and as we talk to the conditions, tie them to the order and most specifically -- rather them to the facts presented in the case and most specifically, tie them to the -- the testimony and evidence presented in the case that we feel -- the Board feels need to be conditioned in order to mitigate or potentially mitigate an -- a potential adverse impact.

So, we'll open it up. Mr. Etherly, did you want to take on the first or I'm sorry. Ms. Mitten, did you have?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I don't know when you would like to discuss this particular item because sometimes we talk about timing issues at the beginning of the discussion and sometimes we talk about it at the end. I think there's some merit maybe to taking this up in the beginning.

But, is the -- one of the -- the first proposed condition from the applicant which is troubling to, me and I think it will affect the conversation that we have, is that they would like to have the flexibility to proceed in two phases and the second phase which would be the performing arts center, there would be -- they would basically have ten years to begin construction on the performing arts center.

And this is -- you know, timing issues, we have these when we do PUDs as well and, you know, there's -- typically, there's a similar window on PUDs as a -- as a BZA order where you have to apply for a building permit within two years and then start construction within three and the reason for that is because you're making a decision with a particular set of facts and there's -- there's going to be a significant amount of change on this, you know, if we call it a campus, the larger campus with the

1 completion of the parking garage at some point in the 2 future. 3 And I'd be very concerned about making the 4 decision about the performing arts center on the set 5 of facts that exist today, but then they don't need -they won't necessarily construct it for ten years when 6 7 the set of facts may be completely different. So, I'm 8 -- I'm really concerned about the conditions we put in 9 place given that they might not be building it for ten 10 years. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 11 So, I don't know if 12 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: you want to have that discussion now or at the end, 13 14 but I think it will impact how we view the conditions 15 we put in place. Indeed and as this 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 17 is condition number one, I think it's appropriate to 18 take it up at this point. 19 I -- I -- I tend to agree that I -- I was 20 a little concerned of -- of how we do that. However, 21 I also -- of -- of the understanding of the difficulty 22 in having to start all of this in large part within 23 two years in order to effectuate or to utilize the -the order. 24 25 I think we ran into this -- well, I know

we ran into this issue in a previous case in terms of looking at a master plan that was then going to be phased in.

I guess the point I would make on this is that even though we're making the -- making the decision based on today's facts, we're not expecting that this performing arts center is not going to be there in ten years. I would certainly imagine that they would want to build this as quickly as possible, but it may not be feasible to do that within two years because of some of the other issues involved in doing that large of a development.

But, I'm not convinced at this point -- I think -- I think we need to have some discussion on what we think would be changing then that might impact a decision that we'd make today. Is it actually all those that we have presented? Would it actually be making a better situation in the future in terms of the construction of the -- the parking structure, in terms of anticipation of what will be or do we really need to be concerned, which I'm open to hearing, to be concerned that it would so substantially change within the next ten-year period?

Is that -- does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: It -- it does

make sense. I guess there's -- there's a couple of things that I would say. I understand what -- your point about the fact that they would probably want to proceed as quickly as possible, but may not be able to proceed and that's all the more reason why, you know, if -- if -- if they think they can proceed, then you put them on a short window. If they can't, they come back and they make representations to the Board about why they need an extension and it allows for the opportunity for at least there to be a discussion in the event that background conditions have changed which we would lose if we just let them -- we allow them to have a ten-year window to begin construction.

I think the -- the thing that is probably the biggest wild card in what might happen within the next ten years, is what -- what is the impact of the parking garage? You know, everybody anticipates that the parking garage would be utilized fully and that it will be managed in a way that will significantly relieve any adverse impacts on the neighborhood, but we -- we don't -- we don't know that.

And one of the reasons is that we don't know and they don't know yet how the financial set up is going to work. They know they're going to charge for parking and they -- they have certain -- certainly

they have a -- there's going to be a balance between charging too much and causing people not to use the parking garage, but they need to charge enough to -- to recoup their investment. So, they're going -- you know, they're going to try and find that happy medium where they keep the parking garage utilized.

But, you know, we just don't have any

But, you know, we just don't have any experience in a residential neighborhood like this with a parking garage where you pay to park, where there's at least the opportunity for people to park in the neighborhood. We don't know what the success of that's going to be.

So, that to me is the biggest wildcard about what might happen and that is a significant factor for the performing arts center because it's going to be bringing large groups of people into the neighborhood with the expectation that they would park in the parking garage, but we just don't know that.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I think that's an important point and what I'd like to hear from you, Ms. Mitten and other Board Members, is what's our perspective or what's the facts of how much increased use we're actually talking about.

I -- I think we'd be absolutely appropriately set if this was a brand new institution

or private school that was being built and we couldn't measure. We didn't know.

In ten years, yes, the world changes, but first of all, the reconfiguration of the athletic fields, I don't think is -- there -- there is a lot of detail in who's using or not using in the summer. But, overall, the -- the increase in use is not what the reconfiguration is about and I wasn't -- it is -it is my understanding in reading the record that the performing arts center actually substantially increases the attendance. I mean these -- the -- the -- the -- certain performances are already currently happening just in different parts. Already have -- is a consolidation all into one.

So, I guess my -- my question is are you -- are you looking at this as such an increase intensity of use that it is difficult for us to understand what the impacts will be or is this, as I see it, more as the -- as the building of the parking structure in order to accommodate that -- that intensity of use that's current and that is project to go forward?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I don't disagree with your point about the -- you know, that -- that there's not a dramatic intensity of use associated

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with the performing arts center.

I guess I go back to the threshold point of my -- at least my understanding that the reason for building the parking garage is that there -- that the -- that the Cathedral Foundation or the -- the grouping of entities there perceive -- because this is a significant investment, they perceive that there's an existing adverse impact on the neighborhood related to parking.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Because otherwise if they didn't perceive that, then they wouldn't make this huge investment. They're not in -- they're not speculating that they're going to make money off the parking garage. They're hoping to break even on the parking garage.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And that's a -- that's an excellent point to bring up because I -- I think if I'm not mistaken that we need to look at the impacts of the application of the St. Alban's School and I think that's what's difficult and -- and -- and the specifics of this is that the parking garage is accommodating all the other uses that are

1	actually not before us and so, I know it's difficult
2	for me to kind of separate out those aspects, but I
3	don't think we can I don't think it's appropriate
4	for us to lump this entire this application into
5	the entire issues of which that structure is is
6	meaning to solve.
7	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And I'm not and
8	I'm not suggesting that we should. I guess what I'm
9	saying is is in any other case, you you don't
10	look at the property or the the project in
11	question in isolation.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum.
13	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: You look at it in a
14	context.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum.
16	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, that context
17	is intended to change. The parking you know, the
18	degree the the traffic and parking impacts will
19	change. That's the intention.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: It's and the
22	intention is that will it that it will improve,
23	but there's no guarantee that it will improve.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Right.
25	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't disagree. 2 I think you're absolutely right. We look within the context, but what's affecting the context is what is 3 4 being proposed by St. Alban's and that's where I go 5 back to the issue of I don't see in this application the proposal that the intensity of use is such that we 6 7 could not project out any difficulties if they -- if 8 they built the performing arts in that time frame. 9 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: When you say that 10 though, I guess my concern is what do you -- what do you have in your head about what is the background 11 12 condition related to the general state of parking in the neighborhood and are you -- is -- is it in 13 14 your head that -- and it may be because that's what 15 the representations have been that parking -- the --16 the background conditions will improve and I'm saying 17 in -- in ten years, we'll know whether that, in fact, is the case and -- but, it's not guaranteed. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. COMMISSIONER 20 So, i f MITTEN: t.he 21 performing arts center isn't going to be built for ten 22 years, why can't we have that conversation when it's 23 ripe and make sure that what our expectations were 24 today actually came to -- came true.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS:

25

Right.

Right.

Procedurally, I think that's very well said and I would tend to move in that direction generally speaking in a procedure.

However, looking at the specifics of the case as presented before us, first of all, in my own deliberation, I'm not persuaded by the evidence presented that there's a large or any significant onstreet parking adverse impact created. We had several of the adjoining neighbors testify to the fact that they couldn't find parking. We also had the applicant testify to the fact that the surrounding houses, the majority of which if not all of which, I don't -- I remember looking at the data trying to find anyone that didn't have a driveway. That there is off-street parking made available.

There was no specific events or times or elements or calculations that was presented in the -- in the hearing that showed me or persuaded me that there was such a substantial or any overflow parking. That it was overwhelming we're actually having adverse impact on the surrounding area.

So, I guess that's where I -- where I go to when -- when we look at okay, so, what is this going to solve? For -- for -- from my perspective, my deliberation, the -- what is being proposed by St.

1 Alban's this garage is not going to solve any of those 2 adverse conditions created by the performing arts 3 center or the reorientation of the athletic fields. 4 I guess to make that point maybe more 5 direct, I'm wondering if there weren't the other associated uses in the surrounding area, would we be 6 7 talking so substantially about the parking problems. We certainly wouldn't be talking about such a massive 8 9 parking structure being built. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to add --11 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 13 that I don't think that we should throw out phasing 14 15 because of that concern. I think that phasing is a result of good master planning and working with the 16 community and it -- it contemplates fund raising and 17 has some, you know, positive characteristics that go 18 19 with it. 20 I think we can, as the Chairman said, look 21 at the evidence and project out, but if you -- if you 22 or others of us on the Board don't feel comfortable 23 projecting out that far, I -- I think another 24 alternative would be to put in a relieve valve. Ιf

like ten years from now, the -- the parking has -- has

gotten terrible in the neighborhood or traffic is terrible as a result of the garage, that maybe they could come before the Board.

I know we don't have that right now as -- as far as making modifications to orders, but I -- I don't think it's the phasing that's -- that's the problem.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, and -- and maybe it isn't and maybe other people aren't -- aren't troubled by it as much as I am and I guess -- I guess maybe the reason I'm troubled by it most is because unless I overlooked something, this is the first time I've heard about the phasing and the desire to have a ten-year window and so, there wasn't an airing of any concerns that, you know, the community might have had on the subject and so, I feel a little disadvantaged by not having anything in the record that would support departing from our normal -- the -- the normal timing on the order and, you know, we've had -- as I said in some PUDs, we've had -- you know, there have been requests for phasing, but we've talked about it and like I said I'm open to the fact that I may have overlooked it, but I don't remember that being something that was presented or discussed.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Well, that's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 a good point that I'd like to address and lets hear 2 from other Board Members if the -- they recollect the 3 presentation from the applicant of the phasing 4 elements. 5 Mr. Mann, did you want to speak to that? I'd like to ask Ms. Mitten 6 MEMBER MANN: 7 a question if I could. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure. 9 MEMBER MANN: This might be discussing the 10 same thing, but put in a different way. It sounds like at the moment you've developed a scenario where 11 12 the preferred alternative might be to assess the the parking garage before 13 of 14 development of the performing arts center, but as I 15 understand it, the performing arts center is being deferred mostly as a cost consideration. I don't know 16 17 definitively if that's true, but let's assume for the moment that it is. 18 19 If the applicant were proposing to build 20 the performing arts center right now or within the 21 next two years, how would that change your analysis of 22 the situation? 23 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: It wouldn't change. 24 I mean that's the way I would like to approach it.

Because I'm uncomfortable and this -- this is not

isolated to this case. This comes from a lot of -- a lot of other circumstances and when we've had cases that have -- where we've had requests for extensions, this -- again, before the Zoning Commission, we have an opportunity each time they come for an extension to say have the background conditions changed?

It gives you the chance to revisit it and make sure that those -- those underlying conditions that, you know, if we -- if we put them on the normal time frame, you know, the two years to get a building permit and three years to start construction, I would be comfortable proceeding that way and I -- and I would be comfortable with, you know, if they're -- if they're -- if they need an extension to provide an opportunity for that to come back, but to let there be a public airing at that time.

Because I've seen time and time again where background conditions have changed.

MEMBER MANN: When you're talking about background conditions, are you talking about background conditions that pertain only to the operation of the -- of the close or -- or background conditions that are external to school like changes in traffic or neighborhood density or --

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Typically, it is a

change in in in external condition. Because
it's you make the decision in a context and that's
important and that's why, you know, traffic studies
are done and that's why DDOT waives in with, you know,
with their opinion on on future impacts and that's
why the Office of Planning sets out the, you know, the
the development context and I frankly, you know,
given the way Washington is these days, I wouldn't
pretend to predict what conditions would be ten years
from now.
So, I guess I'm just I'm just troubled
by foreclosing the opportunity for future discussion
if, in fact, this doesn't get billed, you know, for
ten years.
MEMBER MANN: It seems to me that you
present an argument that cuts both ways, but and
and I think you can make some sort of argument that
some sort of intensive analysis is required for every
single use that's going to occur that could
potentially affect traffic for X number of years and
then use that argument either way to bolster the
argument.
So, I'm not certain that I would would
be against the phasing.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I I don't sense

that I'm persuading much of anybody, but I did want to put my concerns out there.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Ms. Mitten, let me just ask you this on -- on the line that I was pursuing. Would you feel comfortable if -- if, for instance, in granting approval for the arts center or for this special exception in this case if there was something that said after it's built or a year after it's built they'd come back before the Board on that question of -- of -- I'm just throwing this out. I don't know if it's in our regulations, but on -- on usage. Is it working out? Do there need to be other conditions to limit cars or whatever it is?

I just don't think that it's -- I personally don't think it's the phasing question. I think it's -- you're saying ten years down the road you don't know if there might be a problem.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, that -- I mean that's certain true. The -- the -- the approach that we take typically -- we have -- we have sort of two approaches. One is we give people orders that -- that have a -- that have a finite life. We approve it for a particular period of time because we want to see something come back and we want to revisit it because we think well, you know, conditions could change. So,

that's one approach which is kind of what you're suggesting. That they would come back after some period of time.

And then the other approach typically when people building something like this and it's not a -- it's not a use, it's -- it's construction that's going to have a life 30/40/50/100 years, we don't have them come back because they've made a big investment. So, and I understand that and I -- and I wouldn't -- I wouldn't want to take that approach with an investment of this kind.

But, I -- my view is if you're going to make that investment ten years from now, come back in ten years and let's talk about it then. That's -- that's -- that's typically the approach that the commission has taken which is bring something to us when it's ripe.

and -- and I think the fact in my understanding in looking at numerous private schools that have now come before that have such long-term projects. I -- I think Ms. Miller said it correctly that they may be in a different realm than a developer proposing a class A office building downtown which they need to get in and out of the ground quickly.

This involves an awful lot of coordination, fund raising and it may take years and years before they're actually even ready to put in for a permit, but then how do you start that process without having some assurance that you can actually do it. It's -- we've been presented, limitedly in this case, but certainly in others, the -- the complexity of -- of pulling this type of project together.

Ms. -- Ms. Miller, you bring up an excellent point of is there -- is there a compromise here that we might entertain and discuss and I think that we should take a little bit of time to look at that.

My concern is that if we went in that direction, I'm not sure just making a statement that come back and tell us is it all working works well. We're going to need to be very definitive of what measure that we're looking for and then thinking about that, I was thinking well, who does the measurement and how is actually going to be presented.

We can get through that I believe, but then I go to the specifics of the case that -- that we get into now and -- and remembering the hearing and -and my own review of the -- the facts, again, I go back to okay, well, where is the evidentiary items

1 that we're trying to mitigate here? Where is it and 2 I am -- as this individual on the Board, I am not 3 persuaded that this is the largest impact for us in 4 this application and so, again, I'm not persuaded that 5 that is what needs to set it back for a secondary hearing. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I -- I agree 8 and I'm not -- I -- I don't think we're there yet and 9 I just want to say that in other cases, sometimes we 10 have put a time limit on our special exception because there's development in a neighborhood that's changing. 11 You know, it's downtown. I think we know that things 12 are going to be changing and I think we have to look 13 14 at the context that this special exception is being 15 offered in. Is this a neighborhood that is changing? How drastically do -- is there evidence in the record 16 17 that things are going to change? 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have an 19 answer to that? 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I have an 21 opinion, but I think we ought to go through the 22 conditions. I just think that we don't just deal with 23 it in a vacuum. 24 think this is -it's been

very

stable

in a

represented

it's

25

residential

neighborhood and -- and the school and the close have been there for a long time. So, I don't -- traffic on Wisconsin Avenue may be changing as a result of other things, but that's, you know, I think we should look at the evidence.

Though if we look at the conditions, I just want to make sure that we -- we are -- if that's okay if we turn to the condition. There were so many different conditions that were submitted. If we could just be reading off the same page to begin with.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you want us to go to page 14 of 19 of the proposed order? Exhibit 54.

MEMBER ETHERLY: And -- and -- and -- and that was, Mr. Chair, I believe where -- where Ms. Mitten was -- was -- was taking us in terms of -- of her start.

What -- what I'm -- what I've done

-- what I'm suggesting is essentially we, of course,
have Exhibit Number 54 which has already been
reference, the applicant's exhibit which runs through
concerns that they had regarding the ANC's proposed
conditions, but at the close of that exhibit, outlines
the proposed order, conclusions of law and the
findings of fact and perhaps it's a workable process
to go through those conditions as -- as they have been

1 set forth beginning at page 14 of 19 and then perhaps 2 cross-referencing back where there are 3 discrepancies between the applicant's position and the 4 ANC's position. 5 Of course, once again, the ANC's submittal at Exhibit Number 53 runs through their conditions in 6 7 -- in excellent detail with the adverse impact and 8 mitigating condition language and then, of course, the 9 rationale and similarly, of course, at Exhibit Number 10 47, you also have a straight -- straightforward recitation of the conditions as they've been offered 11 by the -- by the applicant. 12 But, I would perhaps suggest just starting 13 14 at 14 of 19, going through the conditions. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Let's do 15 16 and let's -- let's -- we -- we have gone through 17 initially condition one. I would like to return to that at the end of our deliberation on the rest of the 18 19 conditions. 20 MEMBER ETHERLY: No objection, Mr. Chair. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just also want 21 22 to throw out why we're discussing these conditions and 23 the conditions can be to -- usually, they're to 24 mitigate objectionable or adverse conditions that have 25 been identified in the hearing.

In this case, the applicant has stated that these conditions are necessary to insure parameters for school operations that will insure that no objectionable or adverse affects will be created.

So, I -- I guess maybe it's easy to -easier to focus as we go through the conditions
whether or not we -- we really think there is an
adverse impact that's been shown or, you know, whether
this is the -- to insure that there won't be.

And also, some of these conditions, I think, when we're evaluating them, they're being proffered by -- some of them are by the applicant themselves whether or not we find that they're necessary and I -- I think perhaps we can -- need to address that, too. Whether we think that they're necessary or -- or just accepting them because -- because of the desire of the applicant to put parameters on.

But, I would say in general that I think parameters are important to a certain extent if you got to measure objectionable conditions. For instance, if the student enrollment could just grow expedientially with no limitation whatsoever, then we wouldn't be able to tell whether there would be an adverse impact down the road. So, I think they are

helpful to that extent.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Condition Number 2 then goes to the fact of the -- the current enrollment and then the discussed and offered total maximum permitted enrollment of 579.

I think we ought to write this condition if it is so accepted by the Board not to establish this 2 percent overage account, but rather that that condition states that -- that the maximum permitted enrollment is 579. We can, in fact, include in the findings of facts that the goal is 568 and that there is a utilization and a fluctuation, but it is not. It -- it seems to me to be going further on in a condition that we don't necessarily need and it's more of a finding. We certainly wouldn't require them or be out of order if they fell below 568 or we don't need to get into that kind of detail.

The other issue of the 143 faculty and staff, they've broken it down into several iterations.

One is full-time equivalent faculty and staff. They also break out the part-time and full-time.

It would seem to me from the evidence presented that the -- the total faculty and staff persons which I think is a -- a better way of assessing, in fact, that's the way I looked at this

1	application, would be 143 persons, faculty and staff.
2	Yes.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't read it
4	that way.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I think that
7	that's where we've had this discussion with respect to
8	full-time equivalents. The full-time equivalents can
9	be divided between several part-time employees and,
10	therefore, this number is is hard to enforce and I
11	I personally don't think that the you know, the
12	Board hasn't yet made a finding that it's necessary to
13	have a limit on the use of that.
14	I think that perhaps it should be stated
15	as their intention, but what I don't want to see
16	happen is a battle down the road that they had, you
17	know, ten part-time employees and that wasn't
18	contemplated by our condition. Because we really
19	didn't have evidence in the record that there was a
20	need to have a strict cap here and
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think we might be
22	saying the same thing.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: we need to be
24	careful with it. Okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I I want a total

1	person count. I don't want to differentiate between
2	full-time equivalents or how many part-times or full-
3	times and they stated the fact that they have 143
4	persons.
5	Although in the first sentence in that
6	condition, they say 143
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: FTEs.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: FTEs and look at
9	in paren the actual count is 128 and 15 which is 143.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It is right now,
11	but again
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, you're saying
13	they may want to
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: They may want to
15	make some changes down the road and divide another
16	full-time position into two part-time positions.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. I see.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I, you know,
21	I don't think there's evidence in the record that
22	that this this should be a problem
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: if they do
25	that, but I just wanted to be I just don't want to

1	have any battles down down the road. That it's
2	clear that
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: that they
5	they can do this.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, are you
7	suggesting that condition number 2 read the number of
8	students would be 579 and leave it at that?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I have no
10	problem with their 143 FTEs. It it just I just
11	want
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: it
14	understood. I mean the that that number the
15	number of employees and staff actually will will
16	could fluctuate under this order.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But, I don't
19	have a problem with that.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Our discussion at
21	this point then generally condition number 2 goes to
22	579 students and employee of 143 FTEs.
23	Mr. Etherly, difficulty with that?
24	MEMBER ETHERLY: No objection, Mr. Chair.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

1 MEMBER ETHERLY: Ι agree with the 2 direction. With -- and -- and -- and you 3 eliminating the -- the -- what I agree also 4 superfluous language regarding 2 percent increase over 5 that goal. The language as it relates to St. Alban's 6 7 may increase the number of students, faculty and staff 8 only with the approval of the Board of Zoning 9 Adjustment, would you include that language or also strike that? I would strike that as well. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, I would strike 11 12 that. MEMBER ETHERLY: Excellent and then I 13 14 think there was some -- some disagreement with regard 15 to the submittal of some type of November 1 report to -- to the ANC. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good and that goes up to your issue of the address of those issues and I 18 19 think the objection as I read it is having a listing 20 of specific faculty and staff as a -- not something 21 that the -- St. Alban's is able to do, but that they 22 could provide as they're stating here no later than 23 November 1 each year a total number --24 MEMBER ETHERLY: A count. 25 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- of students and

1	faculty and staff for the academic year. I'm open to
2	the discussion on that.
3	MEMBER ETHERLY: I would have no objection
4	to the language as it's as it is proposed by the
5	applicant here no later than November 1 of each year
6	submittal of the total number of students, faculty and
7	staff.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Ms. Miller.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, I think
10	that I think that that's well stated because I
11	think the number is the issue and that's what the
12	community wants to know and that's where the impact is
13	on the number not the names.
14	And are we striking the the part about
15	that they can increase the number of students, faculty
16	and staff only with the approval of the Board of
17	Zoning Adjustment because
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's correct.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's that we
21	that's a statement of fact.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We don't need
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Exactly.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: in the condition.

Okay. Anything else on two?

Very well. Let's move on to three. Parking situation for faculty, staff, students. St. Alban's will require faculty, staff and students who drive to school do not have valid zone three residential parking permits to park on the close and between the parking garage to relocate under the cathedral bond in designated off-street parking or on the areas of the street not restricted to zone three parking.

St. Alban's shall direct faculty, staff and students with the zone three RPPs to park on the close before resorting to on-the-street parking.

It seems to me a condition of intention.

Comments?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think it goes to mitigate park -- or preclude parking problems in the neighborhood and I think perhaps we should discuss whether we found that there were parking problems and my recollection is that applicant's traffic expert identified many parking spaces available during the day and that the parking garage was going to provide for 307 new parking spaces.

We went through a lot of figures about the parking demand at St. Alban's and whether it was being

met.

So, this -- first of all, I guess I don't find that there is a drastic problem, but I do find that -- or I do think that it would be -- that the -- it would be good for the garage to take the cars that are parking on the streets, off the street and into the garage.

This whole requiring cars or not allowing them to park on public streets, I think is very problematic. I think we really have to find that there is an egregious state of the parking problems in the neighborhood to disallow people who are otherwise entitled to park on the street and I think that it also creates problems in neighborhoods where some of the students live or visit other students in the neighborhood and then what's happened if they're parking on the street and how is it enforced and I just don't think that --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Enforcement is a big issue.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I would tend to agree. However, I disagree with you a little bit on this aspect. I think that having a program as it's been offered by the applicant to require faculty and

1 staff and students who drive to be accommodated with 2 parking is appropriate for two reasons. 3 One, I don't think that the evidence was 4 necessarily presented in this case that that is a 5 However, a condition can try to mitigate a potential problem and I think looking at the number of 6 7 students and the number of faculty and -- and staff, 8 that if you put 140/150/200 cars on the street, there 9 would be an impact. Would it be absolutely catastrophic? I --10 11 I don't know if I can measure that, but there would be 12 a negative impact to that and then specifically directly to it, 206.3, as private schools do not have 13 14 a parking requirement set forth in the regulations, but rather have to accommodate ample parking. 15 It is again asked of us to establish and 16 judge and set the level of what is ample and what is 17 18 not. 19 So, I think this does go to fulfilling the requirements that -- in that in terms of 206.3 and I 20 21 think it is a base level of which can be done and that 22 is a requirement of it. 23 How they require it or how they program 24 it, I don't think we necessarily can get into, but the

mere fact that they do require it.

25

Therefore, you

would be -- there -- there would be some remedy within the -- the schools operating agreements. That's for their own enforcement to do and then anything on the public streets, obviously, that are illegally parked would be for other agencies to enforce.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You know, I think I may have jumped the gun because I -- going into -- it's later on where they talk about not parking on the street, but I -- I am not sure how they differentiate between the zone three residential parking permit people and the rest of the students or faculty. Why shouldn't everybody be -- if there's a space for the -- required to park, I think the -- I think perhaps it was because there was maybe not a space for everybody on the -- you're right. It's not all that enforceable. It's a good policy.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Others?

MEMBER ETHERLY: Well, I don't know that I can add much that's going to help us bring this to any decision, but I tend to agree with Ms. Miller in that the problem that I have is that while I -- I think it seems like a fine idea that the school should enter into some sort of agreement with its faculty and students to enforce parking in a way that fulfills certain objectives.

1 The problem that I have is telling people 2 that they can or cannot park in areas where they're 3 legally allowed to park independent of some sort of 4 larger traffic management plan. 5 mean if they want to condition condition that or make -- make parking restrictions a 6 7 condition of their employment or their enrollment, then -- then that's fine, but I just don't see this as 8 the smoothest mechanism to achieve that. 9 10 quite certain how to resolve that. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 11 Okay. Yes, Ms. 12 Mitten. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I -- I guess on that 13 14 point, I'd be inclined to accept the conditions as 15 it's proffered by the applicant and -- and kind of 16 leave it at that. Because I -- what I don't agree 17 with -- with what the ANC was suggesting which is that, and Ms. Miller spoke to, which is prohibiting 18 19 someone who has a legal right to park on the street to -- to kind of reach that far. 20 21 Ιf the -- if the applicant can 22 something to encourage people who otherwise have that 23 right to park elsewhere, great. Let's let them try 24 and pursue that, but for the Board to impose something

more restrictive, I'm merely uncomfortable with that.

1 So, I -- I would say that the way the 2 applicant has proffered this is what I'd be -- be -as far as I'd be willing to go. 3 4 MEMBER ETHERLY: I would agree, Mr. Chair. Very well. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: comment on that? 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: My only comment is -- is on the last, you know, sentence. 8 9 extent that we adopt conditions that are -- are hard to enforce, I mean how -- how do you require students 10 with zone 3 RPPs to park on the close before resorting 11 12 to on-street parking? Does that mean that -- I mean I'm just -- you know, maybe this is minutia, but they 13 14 have to drive all around the close first to make sure 15 there's no parking and then -- then park on the 16 street. It -- it seems kind of unrealistic. 17 Somehow it seems like it would be better if -- if the 18 19 school provided spaces for the faculty, staff and 20 students with the number that they can provide. 21 -- then the rest of those students, you know, but 22 anyway, I understand part of this was that some of them are on a first-come, first-served basis. 23 24 I mean we can put this in. It's just it's 25 hard -- it's very hard to enforce.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I absolutely agree 2 and -- and absolutely, in the case, we've tried to put 3 out there needs to be exact clarity so that people 4 understand that there needs to be a measurable element 5 and that -- that, of course, lends itself 6 enforceability. The last sentence I tend to agree. 7 However, it does seem to go to the intent of what is 8 being proffered in -- in the overall condition or 9 requirements. 10 I'd be -- I'd be just as well to keep it in at this point and move on unless others feel 11 12 differently. Very well. We have condition three has 13 14 been discussed. Let's move on to four, parking during 15 construction of the Foundation garage. Now, that is talking about providing off-site temporary parking 16 17 during the construction phase. Comments? Questions on that? Is everyone 18 19 amenable to keeping it in as stated? 20 If there's no objection to that, then 21 let's move on to five which is the parking management 22 The Foundation at St. Alban's will activities. 23 employees to participate encourage its in 24 Foundation's "Commuter Rewards Programs" which is part

of the submission and we'll put an exhibit number on

1	that if this condition is accepted. Which would
2	reduce parking demand among the faculty and staff.
3	Comments on that? Yes, Mr
4	MEMBER MANN: Can this be part of the
5	larger traffic management program and does it need to
6	be listed with such specificity rather than just as
7	part of the TMP?
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't I'm not
9	aware of any reason why it couldn't be in in a
10	larger condition.
11	MEMBER MANN: I just don't see it as I
12	don't know where the enforceability is again with the
13	words like will and could, gets employees to
14	participate.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
16	MEMBER MANN: I don't know how you enforce
17	that.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
19	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I was just going to
20	say well, you enforce it by saying give us evidence
21	that you encouraged your employees. So, I think, you
22	know, it's not unenforceable. It's just not you
23	know, it's there's gradations of compliance with
24	it.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, I I think

in -- in order to address this, I think one of the best conditions that we've done in terms of writing them when we have plans submitted into the record is that we condition the fact that the applicant would implement their plans as shown in exhibit as decided whether it be transportation management or this parking management.

So, we're looking for implementation of the management activities and -- and we've also lent flexibility to changing those plans as long as there is one in place that goes to in this case parking.

MEMBER ETHERLY: But, I would -- I -- I agree with Ms. Mitten's observation, but I -- I would also -- I think there is a kernel of -- of -- of utility in Mr. Mann's observation about perhaps broadening the language. I think the spirit of that particular proposed condition number 5 is to speak to St. Alban's taking steps to encourage alternative methods of transportation separate and apart from actually driving to the facility.

So, if there is perhaps some additional language that can be added to broaden that condition whether it's the Foundation in St. Alban's will encourage its employees to utilize public transportation, mass transportation and other, you

1 know --2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 3 MEMBER ETHERLY: -- I'm suggesting some 4 kind of directions. I believe Mr. Mann has hit on 5 something in terms of perhaps broadening it so the applicant's efforts aren't simply limited to the 6 7 commuter rewards program which is an 8 suggestion I might add. So, I don't know if there's some lines 9 that can be added to do that, Mr. Chair. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, I think there 12 I mean I think it will, in fact, might well be. consolidate a couple 13 encompass and and 14 conditions that are about to come forward. So, maybe 15 we look at it in that -- in that frame. What we could add to. I certainly don't hear the Board saying that 16 they want to remove condition five, but what will we 17 add to condition five when we go through. 18 19 Is that amenable to everybody at this 20 point? 21 MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Let's move on 23 then and look at the exact language of five and come 24 back to six, parking policy registration. Beginning

September 2005, St. Alban's shall establish a parking

policy for its faculty, staff, students that will be consistent with condition 3 and 4 above. policy will require any student, staff or faculty member who drives to school to register his or her vehicle in the school and to display the identifying sticker on his or her vehicle that will facilitate compliance with the parking policy. In some sense, Mr. Mann, that might consolidate into five. Is that correct? MEMBER MANN: I believe those are all elements of -- of what should be --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And, in fact, I would say -- dare say seven would also go into it and possibly even eight, but let's take up specifics on six. Comments? Deliberative? Ms. Miller, did you indicate you had something to say? VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I was just looking at the transportation management plan and I think that, you know, a lot of these are set forth in that plan and I'm not sure whether we would want to should just say that they comply with their transportation management plan which would take them all in there, but --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which is exactly where Mr. Mann was going.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Exactly.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But, my concern
4	is I have to really, you know, examine this to see
5	whether they they might want some flexibility in
6	in that plan for which a condition might not get
7	you know, if we said they had to comply with all of
8	these, then maybe we we'd have to give them some
9	leeway to change if circumstances suggested it would
10	be a good idea to change. So, we can see as we go
11	along.
12	MEMBER MANN: Well, the the larger goal
13	that I had in mind was I'm just thinking of it's
14	probably easier to enforce a condition that says they
15	will implement or or they will have a traffic
16	management plan than to say we're going to somehow
17	enforce every single condition that's not necessarily
18	enforceable by
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
20	MEMBER MANN: by BZA.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In fact, that's what
23	we've done in the past. I think is is a productive
24	way to deal with large programs and plans which does
25	lend themselves the flexibility of changing. We

1 we've been specific in some conditions where the evidence was before us that they needed flexibility to 2 3 see how things were going to work or not work. 4 I don't think is that case, but to -- to include in 5 the one condition that Foundation at St. Alban's will implement their TMP I think would be appropriate. 6 7 MEMBER MANN: But, the -- the other thing 8 is how can a -- a TMP allows for a changeover time 9 that Ms. Mitten was discussing earlier? 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum. MEMBER MANN: I mean TMPs are flexible and 11 12 are meant to respond to current conditions. Whereas, our conditions or some of these proposed conditions as 13 stated are meant to be more static and I just believe 14 15 this allows respond to that them to evolving 16 conditions in a way that really captures the spirit of 17 what they're trying to accomplish. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I agree, Mr. Mann. 18 19 MEMBER ETHERLY: As Ms. Miller commented 20 little bit on the -- on the Commuter Rewards segment, you know, I actually, Mr. Chair, on -- on 21 22 second review find the language to be sufficient. 23 -- as it -- as it is currently worded, I think it 24 captures everything that -- that needs to be captured.

Whether you want to consolidate five, six,

1 and seven, I'm -- I'm open to that, but I'm actually 2 comfortable with -- with those conditions as they are 3 worked in the -- as they are already set up after --4 after reviewing. 5 I -- I think it gets at what we're trying 6 to get at. 7 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Others, comments on 8 that point? Comments at that point? 9 Here's one of the considerations, Mr. Mann, that I -- I -- I think I understand from you is 10 11 that we could save the implementation of -- of the 12 TMP, but is there flexibility to revise it and I didn't see anything in the TMP that shows when it's 13 14 reviewed or how it might be reviewed or impacted. 15 But, I think, first of all, five, six, 16 seven and a couple of others of these are taken 17 directly from the document. So, it's almost -- we're doing the same thing in each way however we want to 18 19 word it. 20 But, yes, Ms. Miller. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know. 22 I mean I quess my problem here is that I don't know 23 whether we're jumping the cart because I -- I feel 24 like we're going through these conditions and we're

that sounds like a good idea,

saying oh, yes,

whatever.

But, we haven't really decided whether there are traffic problems to mitigate or potential traffic problems that might be caused by the buildings and I think that would help -- help me certainly to focus on -- on are these necessary conditions or are they just policies that the applicant is willing to implement and -- and we think they're fine, but we don't necessarily think they're necessary.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What's going to happen to establish that point?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, perhaps if we -- I mean I don't want to necessarily throw. I said we -- we could go through the conditions and we are doing that. I'm just having trouble making the connection now. We'll -- because I think that, okay, if I look at -- at the fields, are the fields going to create more traffic?

You know, are -- is that -- what are we trying to mitigate? What are we trying to --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I thing these conditions are mitigated. The impact of the faculty, staff and students and -- and for me, I don't see any reason or -- or testimony or evidence that would persuade me that there wouldn't be an impact with the

numbers that we're being presented.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: There's no -there's no increase that -- that we're talking about.
So, then you're saying that you think the evidence is
there that there is a problem? They still make --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There's -- there's no increase, but -- but currently, they're providing a certain amount of parking on site. It's all being reconfigured and so, now, we're looking at in this reconfiguration in this new facility -- in one aspect, we don't need to look at these conditions as negative, but rather as positive of how these are then going to be dealt with, you know, within the new orientation and the new facilities.

MEMBER ETHERLY: And I -- I would add, Mr. Chair, perhaps this -- this would help Ms. -- Ms. Miller that I do recall from our discussion of the -the traffic analyses that was done by the applicant, Ι think in mУ opinion were some indications of -- of concern around level of service regarding some of the relevant intersections that -that surround the close as we talked about some of the alternative entrance and exit and ingress points for -- for some of the bus traffic for example or for traffic that might be related to some of the school

events.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that were strong indications that there was a tie at least in my opinion as you looked at the data. I'm not suggesting that the applicant said this, but I think as you look at some of the traffic analysis data, I felt that there was -- there was probably some connection with activity operations on -- on the close and in particular at the school and the overall level of service conditions that were analyzed at some of the subject intersections.

these approach of So, as Ι some conditions, I feel that we are -- are, traffic impacts that have addressing some demonstrated and anticipating some likely impacts that would arise if these conditions were not, in fact, included in the order by the introduction of the new performing arts center and the expansion of other fields.

I definitely understand your concern and I agree with you wholeheartedly that as this Board has done before with your leadership definitely insuring that we are -- are being very specific about our condition language and the rationale for that language. I think we're on very solid ground here in

1 terms of the language that we have in front of us. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Chairman. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I think 5 that this order also -- it probably serves 6 purposes. 7 One is to is to capture whatever conditions need to address the adverse impacts that 8 9 result from what's specifically being requested, but the orders that -- that are the special exceptions 10 that grant -- that -- that affect this property, 11 12 they're -- they're very old and so, I don't think there's -- there's some fundamentals that were never 13 14 captured in another order that I think we're -- you know, and everybody's sort of acting in good faith. 15 Is trying to capture like what's -- what's 16 17 the enrollment? You know, what's the amount of faculty? What are the sort of basic conditions that 18 19 we're operating under here and so, I think they don't 20 necessarily specifically speak to what's 21 proposed, but they're sort of trying to just capture 22 everyone's understanding of, you know, how big is this 23 school intended to be and how many people are intended

to be using it and -- and because the other orders are

so old and don't necessarily speak to it.

24

1 So, I think we're doing two things through 2 this order. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Good. Ι 4 think we should proceed and look at the specific 5 conditions with -- and -- and I absolutely agree with what Ms. Mitten said. Some of -- some of this is 6 7 establishing the existing situation. Some of it is 8 looking at the future. 9 And then, Mr. Mann, I will return to you 10 for further comment on it because frankly re-reviewing 11 the transportation management plan it is almost 12 identical to all the conditions that are in here. So, the question is more of a -- an ease 13 14 understanding perhaps of the writing of the order, but 15 certainly the elements and substance are identical. 16 So, how we put it in is really the fundamental 17 question and how we look at it as being enforceable under our order. 18 19 So, going then to six, parking policy 20 registration, is there any other further comment on 21 that? 22 If not, let's move to seven which is the 23 enforcement of parking policy which was indicated that 24 St. Alban's would require each parent to agree to the 25 parking policy when the parent signs each year's

1 enrollment contract. 2 Students that violate the schools parking 3 policy would be subject to disciplinary action which 4 will escalate with repetitive violations and which may 5 include non-renewal of enrollment contract for the 6 following year. 7 Any comments, concerns, edits on that? 8 Yes, Mr. Mann. 9 I -- I just want to say I MEMBER MANN: 10 don't see that as an enforceable BZA condition. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I -- I 11 12 I think it's a very good policy and I think the school needs to have it, but again, does this mean 13 14 that the BZA police are going to go out and enforce I don't think so. 15 it. But, I do believe that it 16 MEMBER MANN: 17 can be part of a transportation management program --18 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. 19 MEMBER MANN: -- which can be a condition. 20 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Maybe -- maybe we're 21 -- I'm just not on the same wavelength, but I see that 22 as enforceable because the enforcement is this policy 23 -- the way you would enforce it is show me your 24 enrollment contract. Is this a -- is this a component 25 of it?

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
2	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: That's how it's
3	enforceable.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. The
5	enforceable aspect is that the parent each parent
6	has signed an enrollment contract.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think it's
8	enforceable. I mean I think it's enforceable by the
9	school, but are you saying it's enforceable by the BZA
10	because we'll we'll be able to see whether they
11	have these contracts?
12	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Right. If if
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: somebody were
15	complaining, the the the DCRA inspector would go
16	out and say I need to see a, you know, a generic
17	version of your enrollment contract.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And I need to verify
20	that, in fact, this is a component of it. That's how
21	they would do it.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Good.
23	MEMBER MANN: But, then this would also
24	imply that they can say well, I need to see whether or
25	not you renewed students that were disciplined.

1 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm sorry. 2 MEMBER MANN: It also includes non-renewal 3 of the enrollment contract for the following year 4 which means that we'd have to ask the enforcement 5 officer to check renewal records. Well, 6 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: read it 7 carefully though. Because it says which may include. It doesn't say it shall include. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In some respects, this is different than the other offerings in -- in 10 11 that it is leaving open, which I think the Board had 12 previously concerns of, leaving open what disciplinary action is. Rather than the Board getting 13 14 into establishing exactly what disciplinary action 15 should be. 16 But, Mr. Mann, what I understand you saying is that this still doesn't -- this still gets 17 us too involved in the minutia of the operations of --18 19 of the school. I -- okay. 20 Others? 21 MEMBER ETHERLY: I -- I tend to agree with 22 -- with Ms. Mitten's position on that particular 23 understand the concern language. Ι regarding 24 enforceability, but it would be my understanding that

the primary enforcement aspect of

1 particular condition would be as -- as Ms. -- Ms. 2 Mitten indicated. If I'm a DCRA inspector, I go to the site. 3 4 I request to see a copy of that contract and -- and 5 that's going to be the primary enforcement tool. it's not there, it can't be demonstrated, then -- then 6 7 we would have an issue in my opinion. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, could it 9 be, Mr. Mann, Mr. Etherly, Ms. Mitten, Ms. Miller, 10 this condition number seven enforcement probably would read as St. Alban's will require each parent to agree 11 to the parking policy where the -- the parent signs 12 each year's enrollment contract. Students who violate 13 14 the parking -- school's parking policy will be subject 15 to disciplinary action and leave it at that. 16 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: If you want to leave 17 anything off, I wish you'd get the -- the next clause and maybe leave off the last clause. Because I think 18 19 the fact that it will escalate --20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: T see. 21 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- is important, 22 too. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Good. 24 well. Which will escalate with repetitive violations. 25 Mr. Mann, does that address your concern?

No.

MEMBER MANN: I just don't know how we're going to measure the escalation of -- of repetitive violations.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The ball's over here.

MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes. Yes. Yes. Let me

-- let me volley backwards on that one. No, I -- I

understand the concern and I think we're -- we're -
where we oftentimes struggle is the tension between

trying to craft conditions that are measurable and

specific and are grounded in some identifiable

indicator if -- if you will.

The flip side of that is I think there is to an extent an aspirational role that BZA orders still nevertheless play and I think we're -- we're -- we're firmly in an area where some of this language is going to be somewhat aspirational in that I think -- I think there needs to be a recitation of what this -- what this Board will expect or require in that policy.

So, I -- I understand the concern and especially the concern that well, does this then mean that we will have to police and parse the language and, you know, have an appropriate inspector out there to actually go over it.

1	But, I I just think I I I'm
2	concerned about throwing the baby out with the bath
3	water by pulling that language out. Because I think
4	the the the message, the aspirational message is
5	a very important one and that is insuring that there
6	are appropriate levels of of disciplinary action
7	that are included in the school policy with regard to
8	violations.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I I I
10	agree with Mr. Mann. The Court of Appeals has
11	addressed the whole question about the Board
12	interfering too much in internal affairs of schools
13	and disciplinary action, I think is is one of those
14	areas.
15	Second, I don't know what the evidence is
16	that that that would lead us to impose this.
17	We're we're just accepting this proffer from the
18	applicant.
19	So, I I would be in favor of drawing
20	the line where the Chairman left it subject to
21	disciplinary action.
22	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: The the I
23	think the reason why this is appropriate to accept it
24	with all but the final clause is that this is the
25	teeth. This gives the teeth.

Anything else is to use -- I mean I -- I take -- I -- I just want to adapt a little bit of what Mr. Etherly said which is anything else is just aspirational and this is -- this is the way we get the teeth to say to the school, yes, you have all the best intentions and this is where the rubber hits the road where it's not just you're asking parents to comply. You're asking students to comply. It's that there will be enforcement there will be and real enforcement.

To say subject to disciplinary action alone, you know, it could be now, they could write a letter and say you know this is a violation of our BZA order and please don't do that again and that's not -- that's not disciplinary action at all.

So, I think the idea of escalation is that even if the -- even if the first gesture is just a strongly worded letter, that there will be something, you know, more onerous that will -- that will happen, you know, if you keep -- if there's repeated violations and I wouldn't intend to suggest what that should be which I think that would be interfering too much.

But, I don't -- I think this is the only way you can be, you know, that the order has any --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 any way of being -- that we have any way of enforcing 2 all these aspirational things that are in the order. VICE 3 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 4 understand what you're saying. I hear what you're 5 saying about teeth, but we usually apply teeth when we've found a problem that really needs to be 6 7 mitigated and I don't know what that evidence is. 8 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And -- and that I 9 think goes back to the point I was trying to make 10 earlier which is imagine -- I think people are trying to say look, we have a lot of people that are parking 11 12 on the campus and we'd like it to stay that way. know, we'd like people to continue to be drawn into 13 14 the campus and -- and -- and that's sort of one of the -- one of the -- if we were dealing with this as a 15 16 fresh thing, that they were coming new and asking for 17 this, then the adverse impact would be well, if the people don't park on the campus, then that's going to 18 19 cause an adverse impact. So, this is the way of 20 insuring that they do park on the campus. It's -- and -- and -- but, because this is 21 22 -- we're -- we're trying to capture sort of the status 23 quo plus what's being requested, this is the way to 24 keep people on the campus.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER:

25

Well, this --

this is where I want to separate the issues. no increase in there's no there's student enrollment. So, we're talking about students here. In the current state, can the -- is the campus accommodating well enough the students who parking and this is calling for disciplinary action with teeth, et cetera and -- and my question is well, what's the evidence that -- that there's a problem that rises to that level?

We're not talking about the performing arts center which is unknown which may bring in lots of cars at a certain hour. We're talking about student parking and I think we should -- we should look at the evidence. Is there evidence that -- that requires this teeth?

And it's not to say that the applicant can't have a policy with teeth. It's just should the Board be imposing that?

MEMBER ETHERLY: I think -- I think in answer to that question keep in mind that 206.2 does have I think language which suggests that the Board is also compelled to look somewhat at potential future conditions and I want to be very circumspect about how I use that language because I think Ms. Miller's concern is -- is -- is a good one and that is that you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can't necessarily be so forward looking that you lose sight of what the current reality is.

But, I read Section 206 in part to state that a private school must be located so that it is not likely to become objectionable to adjoining and nearby property because of noise, traffic, number of students or otherwise objectionable conditions and I think to an extent the language that -- that we are struggling with and -- and rightfully so because I think this Board, of course, wants to get it right, the language speaks to what would be a likely outcome if there were not satisfactory enforcement.

And I know as we will discuss perhaps in short measure the issue of the performing arts center and that question of -- of a fee. The question is if there isn't any teeth to the policy and this is not -- not to suggest that our -- our -- our young charges at St. Alban's are scofflaws by any stretch of the imagination, but it is to state that if there -- if there were not teeth, would there be a likelihood that the most expedient thing to do rather than going into the close itself will be to grab a spot that is available somewhere on the boundary of -- of the close and I think this language gets to insuring that that likelihood does not -- does not come to pass.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Etherly, I
2	I think that what I'm trying to do is separate the
3	issues. Because here nothing has changed. We're not
4	increasing the student enrollment. There's a history
5	of years and years and years of the school in the
6	neighborhood and nothing is going to change with
7	respect to this this factor because there's no
8	increase in student enrollment.
9	That's why I don't see the need for
10	drastic well, I don't know for teeth or whatever
11	from us.
12	I think when we get to the performing arts
13	center, that is something that is new and your points
14	about that would go go to that one.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And but, the
16	existing condition is the provision of 154 off-street
17	parking for faculty, students and staff. That's the
18	current condition.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It's only going
20	to improve though. They're going to have a garage.
21	So, how is how is
22	MEMBER ETHERLY: Correct. But
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. But
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: why would we
25	need, you know, disciplinary action against the

students?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, you're not held by the 154 as -- as -- as numerous persons have said.

Now, this -- this order is taking us into the next decade and beyond.

So, what -- what are we outlining? What are we saying has to be provided?

And here we have a program that's saying that they will provide all the parking for the faculty and staff that drive that don't have zone three stickers. So --

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I guess my concern is really from the direction of the Court of Appeals that we not interfere with their disciplinary procedures for the most part unless it's, you know, really warranted and I don't see that it's warranted. I don't see any problem. These are -- a lot of these are proffers by the school and I think that it's -- it's maybe a good neighborhood policy for the schools to say to the community, look, this is how we're going to discipline and -- and that's great.

I think -- I think we just need to be careful in drawing the line between what the school is telling the neighborhood it'll do and what we are making an -- an enforceable condition.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, you're advocating that it would read the violation of school's parking policy would be subject to disciplinary action and leave it at that. Okay.

Mr. Etherly, your last word on seven.

MEMBER ETHERLY: Oh, you know, I'm -- I definitely don't necessarily view myself deciding vote on this question. I mean I -- I can live with that language. I definitely can, but I think the observation that Ms. Miller raises is -- is an important one as -- as we move forward here on this deliberation and others and I don't want to lose sight of -- of what I think is attention, but -- but -- but a good one between insuring that our conditions are enforceable and clearly grounded to some actual factual piece that we're trying to deal with, but at the same time, I believe Section 206 does include language so as to not likely become objectionable that enables us to be somewhat forward looking in terms of life after the increasing enrollment or life after the introduction of -- of the performing arts center in a case like this.

But, I'm comfortable with -- with that language as it stands. But, I think the larger point is an important one that we will probably come back to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

again not only in this case, but in others.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Ms. Mitten.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I -- I guess I just would like to make one pitch for the -- the more extensive language of seven and -- and I guess what I would say is if -- if one subscribes to Ms. Miller's point of view, then you have to reject seven in its entirety because you're suggesting that we don't need this at all and so, I would suggest we either reject seven in its entirety or we embrace seven in its almost entirety.

You know, the -- the philosophy that you're -- that you're espousing suggests that, you know, seven is -- is beyond our -- beyond the authority that we have because the record doesn't support it. So, if you believe that, then you have to reject seven wholesale and I would not be in favor of doing that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Let me just say this. I -- first of all, the applicant proffered this and I -- but, I think that -- what I'm dropping off is getting involved in how they're going to discipline. I think that there's a difference in saying okay, it'll be subject to disciplinary action, but that's within the purview of the school how they

1 do their -- how they discipline their students. That 2 -- that's why I would stop there. 3 I think it has the enforceability that you 4 were concerned about. Because we're -- we -- we're 5 qoinq to know that they have these enrollment 6 contracts that parents have to sign. That's something 7 we can see. 8 But, we -- you don't want to create a 9 situation where people are going to be litigating that 10 they're in violation of -- of their disciplinary action before the Board. I think that's what the 11 Court was trying to tell us not to get involved in the 12 intricacies of -- of -- of the type of disciplinary 13 14 action the school will take. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, we have two strong opinions of including the entire seven, one 16 17 to edit it and one to remove it totally. 18 Let's move on. We may have to come back 19 to seven. 20 Visitor cars and buses, visitors who drive 21 to school events and activities including by events 22 summer programs and the performing arts center and who 23 do not have valid zone three parking stickers will be 24 required to park cars in those areas identified in

condition three.

1 St. Alban's School will inform all visitor 2 schools in writing of the designated visitor parking 3 and will require visitors from such schools to park in 4 those areas identified in condition three above to the 5 extent parking is available. Buses will be required to park on the close or in designated off-street 6 7 parking spaces and we did have -- have 8 indication of where those buses would be provided 9 spaces. 10 Comments. Yes. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I like the last 11 12 sentence that buses will be -- be required to park on the close or in designated off-street parking spaces. 13 14 I think that that's clearly enforceable. 15 The -- the rest of it, I -- you know, I 16 don't -- I don't see how that's going to be enforced 17 human nature-wise. They don't say how they're going to require these visitors. You know, it seems like a 18 19 good goal or -- or maybe -- maybe we do need some 20 teeth that's not in here. So, I -- I don't think it's 21 a good condition. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. You -- you 23 want to be --24 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And again, it's

restricting people -- you know, it's like restricting

people's right to park on our streets, you know. have they -- do we have evidence in the record that it I mean I -- I know it's -is such a great problem. it's preferable that there be less cars on neighborhood streets. I think I would rather see incentives in these conditions or something rather than this -- these like will require. I -- I -- it just doesn't mean very much to me.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm going to agree with Ms. Miller on this one. The -- because you don't have any -- there's -- there's no way to discipline a visitor. There's -- what are you going to do, you know? So, to suggest that you can require them to do something, it's -- it -- it isn't enforceable.

When we get down later into the use of the athletic fields by other -- by others, I think then we get into the opportunity that if you're being given a right by the school, then they have the opportunity to require compliance with their parking policy by -- by revoking that right if you don't comply. That's how you get compliance from their other entities.

And for visitors or buses or whoever that
-- because the -- the ANC was talking about the fact
that some buses park illegally on neighborhood streets

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

which is something I face in my own -- on my own street everyday. It's an enforcement issue. You know, it's a -- it's a -- it's a DPW enforcement issue. It's not -- I don't know that we can -- we can hope to -- to extend that to the school, you know, that they become the enforcer or that they become -- you know, I don't know how they would make buses not park on the street, you know. The way the -- you're suppose to penalize those people and they're suppose to get a ticket.

So, I think we can -- to some extent, we can capture the spirit of eight as we move down, but, you know, visitors, I don't know how you could possibly enforce that.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I want to back up a little bit though. I -- I think the way I'm looking at this is like the requirement is very vague, but there are certain things that if we can put in here what St. Alban's will do and I look in here a second look and it says St. Alban's will inform all visitor schools in writing of the designated visitor parking or its parking policies. That's enforceable. I think they should do that. They can -- they could tell them this is where they -- they should park when they come to the school and that will take them off.

But, I also think that they -- you know, maybe we should say -- I mean we're not going to say that -- I don't know that we have the information to do this, but it would be better if it said that St. Alban's will provide parking on site for, you know, visiting schools or whatever. That would be an enforceable --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- meaningful condition.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It's almost as if we're looking for the number of -- of parking that would be provided.

I think that we ought to look at it this way in condition number eight hearing the Board Member's comments that the finding of fact is -- is that this large parking structure is going to be constructed, that a certain portion of that is going to be designated for utilization of St. Alban's School and that we would in this condition note that it would be required that St. Alban's inform the visiting schools of -- of their visiting parking policies and where the parking is made available and absolutely keep in the buses are required to park on the close and designated off-street parking spaces. Leave it at

1	that.
2	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I just want to
3	capture one thing that Ms. Miller said which is that
4	instead of saying the the last sentence, buses will
5	be required to park on the close, that you say
6	adequate parking to accommodate buses for visiting
7	teams or whatever will be provided on the close and
8	and the schools will be directed to those spaces.
9	So, it's a kind of a it puts the
LO	responsibility on the school to provide it and then to
L1	direct them to it.
L2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. That's fine.
L3	I think we can add that in terms of the provision
L4	of
L5	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: But, I but, I
L6	would want to eliminate the first sentence because
L7	that's the one I because it says visitors it
L8	basically says visitors will be required to park their
L9	cars in those areas designated. You can't do that.
20	I mean you can't enforce that.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. No, and
22	that's what I was noting that actually the condition
23	would start more towards St. Alban's will inform
24	visiting schools

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: in writing of the
2	designated visiting parking. Because what we have is
3	a finding has has been presented that there is
4	going to be parking built and provided. With that,
5	the visitors need to know where it is and what the
6	school's policy is.
7	Nine. Yes, good. St. Alban's summer
8	programs, in order to minimize any potential adverse
9	impacts on neighboring properties, St Alban's will
10	limit the hours of outdoor summer programs from 8:00
11	a.m. to 7:00 p.m. St. Alban's shall designate
12	vehicular pickup and drop-off locations on the close
13	for participants in the summer programs.
14	Comments? I don't think we need the St.
15	Alban's shall designate, but vehicular pickup and
16	drop-off locations will be provided on the close for
17	participants in the summer programs.
18	The the enforceability is not that they
19	were designated, but that it happens. Okay.
20	Any other comments?
21	MEMBER MANN: A minor comment just to
22	perhaps give greater clarity to this condition and
23	that is delete in order to minimize any potential
24	adverse impacts on neighboring properties.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

1	MEMBER MANN: And just start the condition
2	St. Alban's will.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. I would
4	I would agree. That's not a sensitive, but an
5	editorial writing I tend to agree with.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: My understanding
7	is and I have to pull it and I'm not sure how we're
8	going to deal with this, but I I this may be
9	have happened before, but I know in this case, I
10	think, that the ANC has a different proposal and do
11	you want to look at their's now or do you want to just
12	go
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Take it up.
14	Absolutely.
15	The ANC was proposing that existing summer
16	programs in the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
17	Stopping in the afternoon. It would allow extensions
18	for different sizes of events. Depends on where you
19	look.
20	Additional comments?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I I
22	don't think there was evidence in the at the
23	hearing or in the record to support limiting the hours
24	to the extent that the ANC proposed.
25	Again, we have a situation where a

school's been operating for a long time. So, there is a record and I don't think the record shows that there's an adverse impact here that needs to be mitigated by curtailment of use in the hours that it's allowed to operate.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Others? Very well.

Moving on to ten, performing arts center, this is indicating that St. Alban's would limit the hours of events at the performing arts center from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday and to midnight on Friday and a.m. Saturday. the performing arts Performances at including rehearsals or practices would be held on no more than 100 days during any calendar year which corresponds to the existing conditions except as provided herein. The performing arts will only be used by the PECF institutions and will not be rented out or otherwise used for commercial purposes.

In rare circumstances, the performing arts center may be made available on a limited basis to a non-PECF not for profit institutions or a community organization that has a compelling need for use of the performing arts center or has suffered the loss of use of a similar facility and requires temporary relief

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from such loss.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, I think in the end it's very interesting wording, but I think it's -- the intent is -- I absolutely agree with it. It seems to me that there are circumstances that we cannot predict, but it's absolutely appropriate to share facilities perhaps on a temporary basis. It doesn't impact greatly the -- necessarily the surrounding impacts of what the order is looking to condition.

I go to a specific circumstance that I've heard of actually, an occurrence of -- in Washington with our private schools where we actually were under somewhat of a siege with the sniper activities and -and there were certain schools that were not letting, not all schools, not letting their children be outside and there were schools that did not have the indoor facilities in order recreate the children, but they could not share in other institutions around, private/public, whichever, because there were certain conditions based from this Board and other orders that would not allow a certain amount of time or occupancy or outside enrollments or nonacademic depending on the -- the school circumstance itself.

I don't think there was ever any intent.

Certainly, there was never any projection or thought

process from this Board that a circumstance of that magnitude might arise, but this seems to speak to hopefully never a condition of that severity, but of rare circumstances that might arise.

Ms. Miller.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think that, you know, that -- that leads me to the general statement I want to make or proposal and that -- that -- that these conditions may be temporarily lifted in rare circumstances to respond to a community emergency or something like that. Because I also heard, you know, in this world with respect to, for instance, hurricane Katrina that, you know, if there's a student enrollment cap, that a school would not be able to take in students, you know, who were displaced by an emergency of that sort and I don't think that this Board would intend to impose that kind of restriction either.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Ms. Mitten.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'd be really concerned about building that kind of a flexibility into our orders and Katrina's a good example. Because while on the one hand we think of it as very temporary, we have no idea how long it's going to take to deal with, you know, accommodating the people who

1 have been displaced. So, it could be -- you know, it 2 could be months. It could be -- it could be years. 3 I mean we just don't know. 4 So, even though we all think it's going to 5 be maybe a matter of days or weeks, it may not be and that's -- and -- and so, I would just be really 6 7 concerned about building that in because even though the condition or the -- the opportunity to depart from 8 9 the condition arose from an emergency, the way that the resolution of that emergency plays out could take 10 a really long time. 11 So, I don't know. I'd be afraid of that. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You know, I --13 14 I hear what you're saying and I'm really kind of 15 raising a philosophical question, but maybe it could be in the -- and it may be a regulation that might be 16 17 needed, but maybe if it were phrased as minor flexibility for instance that would allow a school to 18 19 take in free students or something like that, you 20 know. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Others, comments. 22 The performing arts center, is there any 23 difficulty in terms of excepting the condition of the 24 times, 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 on Sunday through Tuesday,

8:00 to midnight Friday and Saturday?

25

This, of

1 course, does not include practices and rehearsals. 2 Any difficulty there? Not noting -- yes. 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know if 4 we should just pause and -- and I'm sure that the --5 the ANC has some other time recommended. I'm not sure whether Office of Planning or DDOT did. Do you want 6 7 to look at that now? 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Now would be the 9 time. 10 The ANC was recommending a differing number of events. Times also. 11 12 MEMBER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair, as -- as you indicated, there is a -- there is a difference between 13 14 the position of the ANC and the applicant here and I think this is an area where -- where I -- I 15 16 tend to perhaps have a -- have a -- a somewhat different position from -- from that of -- of the ANC. 17 Let me deal first with the -- with the 18 19 issue of -- of performance times and -- and any limitation that's different from what's been offered 20 by the applicant. 21 22 Part of the prism through which I -- I 23 have viewed this case and -- and perhaps some of these 24 very specific issues is also the fact of -- of -- of 25 the nature of the corridor that -- that we are talking about. That corridor, of course, being Wisconsin Avenue.

I think as -- as -- as we attempt to deal with traffic issues and other issues throughout that segment of the city, I think there are some very practical considerations that -- that impact the flow of traffic in this corridor that -- that extend well beyond the close and -- and the St. Alban's use here.

As many of us, of course, are aware, we have a fairly active and vibrant restaurant community just up the street that contributes traffic to this area. All of this just to -- to -- to note that as we get into this issue of timing, I -- I -- I note well the concerns that were raised by the ANC as they discuss this particular issue.

In particular, the time that it may take to -- for patrons to necessarily get out of -- out of the garage following a performance and perhaps walking through. That if you have a performance that ends at 11:00 p.m, you could conceivably, of course, have traffic that might stretch into some late -- some late hours, but I think part of the -- part of the -- the -- the caution here is not trying to necessarily use this order to abate some of the larger traffic issues that are just part and parcel of living in a -- in --

in the urban environment that we find ourselves.

On again, all that being said, I -- I find the time -- the time as it is laid out of the performance hours to be appropriate for -- for this type of facility.

I would agree with -- with -- with the applicant that there is somewhat of a -- of a distinction perhaps to be made between comparing performances at Sidwell Friends with performances at -- at this particular site as the ANC endeavored to do in this particular indication. So, I wasn't necessarily moved by that particular -- particular argument.

Further, but on somewhat different grounds, as it relates to the issue of limiting performances, I will -- I will most certainly come back to the language that Ms. -- Ms. Miller utilized earlier in our deliberation here and that was language regarding getting into the -- the fine -- the -- the -- getting into the operational aspects of -- of our schools and I think this is one area where -- where we find ourselves firmly at the -- at -- at the boundary of.

I do not recall compelling testimony with regard to existing performances on campus nor did I

1 necessarily recall testimony that spoke to а 2 significantly more aggressive or larger programming of 3 the performance arts center space compared to what is 4 currently taking place on campus. 5 Clearly, as the -- as the ANC was right to indicate, you are talking, of course, about a larger 6 7 audience capacity, but I do not recall anything in the 8 record that spoke to more aggressive programming such 9 that -- and I'm not suggesting that the ANC is -- is 10 trying to say that we're looking at off off Broadway coming to St. Alban's and that's not to make light of 11 the ANC's concerns here, but it is to note that I just 12 do not recall and I perhaps invite my colleagues to --13 14 to refresh my recollection if they recall that, but I 15 do not recall anything that suggests that -- that we 16 were going to have a much more aggressive performing schedule that would raise any -- any traffic concerns 17 18 with regard to the hours as they are currently 19 proposed or that would suggest the need for limitation 20 on the number of events at -- at the property. 21 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Yes 23 response.

with Mr. Etherly that we have a history here and it --

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER:

24

25

I would concur

it appears that the -- the number of days is -- is not being increased. They're just -- the performances are being consolidated or -- or switched to the new performing arts center and that there hasn't been a limitation on hours and I don't believe that we had evidence in the record that there was a problem with respect to parking and traffic for performances.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Others.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I just want to be sure that we incorporate a -- a suggestion that was made by the ANC and endorse by DDOT and it's in DDOT's September 2nd memo to us which is that access from the garage should be limited to the Wisconsin Avenue exit for events scheduled to end after 10:00 p.m. to minimize late evening traffic on residential streets and that, of course, would be after construction of the garage, but I think that's an important element of this to keep the traffic on the -- the -- the main street.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I would be opposed to that because I think that the applicant addressed that very well in that the -- the garage from what I understand has been designed with two exits in order that there not be congestion and a whole build-up of traffic on Wisconsin Avenue and that

1	there are also residents across the street on
2	Wisconsin Avenue even though it's it's a a
3	busier street than the other.
4	I think it would create more of a problem.
5	I I don't think we have the evidence in the record
6	to to impose that.
7	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I think
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think that
9	they could that DDOT and and the school would
10	work out should be able to work out the best flow
11	of of the traffic.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: As condition 17 is
13	trying to indicated.
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I guess I would just
15	wonder why we would reject a recommendation from who
16	would be our expert in this case, you know, advising
17	us, you know, through the Office of Planning which is
18	DDOT when we have a when we have a recommendation
19	from them.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, we have
21	we have a recommendation from them, but we really
22	didn't have them before us making this recommendation
23	so that we could explore it with them. All we have is
24	their recommendation.
25	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, and it's

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't --2 COMMISSIONER it's MITTEN: recommendation that was made as a -- as an additional 3 4 submittal, but -- but I guess what -- what I heard you 5 say was that we don't have any evidence in the record to suggest why we should do this and what I'm saying 6 7 is that we have a recommendation from DDOT which is --8 you know, I would -- I would like to know on what 9 basis we would reject that recommendation. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I'm looking at DDOT's report and I see a recommendation 11 12 that says access from the garage should be limited to the Wisconsin Avenue exit for events scheduled to end 13 14 after 10:00 p.m. to minimize late evening traffic on 15 residential streets. That's it. That -- that -- that's like --16 that's a statement and I think it's a statement that 17 we should seriously consider, but then that doesn't 18 19 mean that we end there. I think that the applicant's 20 responded very thoughtfully to that -- to 21 statement. 22 I guess, Ms. Mitten, my other concern is 23 this is ten years out that we're projecting again and 24 that we leave the flexibility of St. Alban's to work

with DDOT to work out the best plan especially since

we don't have much evidence in the record on this. 1 2 They proffer that in their condition 3 number 17 saying that St. Alban's will work with DDOT 4 to study appropriate garage exit points for PAC events 5 and I think that this is going to be a general concern for the close as a whole. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You mean the ingress 8 and egress? 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: From this lot, 10 yes, not just St. Alban's. I don't know that we have evidence in the record that St. Alban's is -- has --11 is likely to create such a different situation as to 12 necessitate our imposing this condition. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I tend to agree, Ms. 15 Miller, and actually, I was a little bit take aback by the second bullet of the DDOT report that access from 16 the parking should be limited to Wisconsin Avenue for 17 -- for the reason that Ms. Miller is -- is stating. 18 Is that I -- I wanted some substantive rationale for 19 20 how they got there. 21 It seems to fly in the face of a lot of 22 the expert witness testimony that we have found before 23 us and that is the more you disperse traffic, the less 24 impact it is in the surrounding area and here we have

DDOT saying you know what?

25

We -- we need to dump

1 everybody from the same place into the same area. 2 I'm not so sure that I'm convinced just by that mere statement that that's the correct way to go, 3 4 but rather that perhaps it is something that should be 5 looked at and dealt with -- with the St. Alban's and DDOT as -- as it's actually implemented. 6 7 Ms. Mitten. 8 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I agree with what's 9 been said about, you know, it would be nice to 10 understand more why DDOT was making this recommendation. 11 I guess I think it's a little ironic that 12 we would be saying well, we're rejecting DDOT's 13 14 recommendation now, but we'd like the applicant to work with DDOT to work out the best plan. 15 I mean I would presume that DDOT is making 16 a recommendation of what they think if the best plan 17 and I think that -- that one of the things to keep in 18 19 mind is that traffic at night is louder than traffic 20 during the day and I think that's why they're trying 21 to force it onto Wisconsin Avenue is because it's --22 you hear it more because there's less background 23 noise. 24 So, that's just me articulating what my

experience has been, but I would just -- I -- I think

1 to me it's a sound recommendation and I'd just like to 2 advocate for it as best I can absent having DDOT here 3 to explain it to us. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Could -- could 4 5 I ask -- could I ask you what evidence in the record 6 would be relying on other than DDOT's you 7 recommendation? Is it just that because DDOT says it 8 we do it? 9 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: No, because there's been -- there have been other occasions where I've 10 disagreed with DDOT based on some other evidence in 11 the record, but I guess what I have yet to hear 12 articulated -- what I hear articulated is let the 13 14 applicant and DDOT work it out as if we didn't have a 15 recommendation from DDOT, but -- but we do. 16 So, that's -- that's what's confusing me. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to ask you also how do you reconcile this with your 18 19 concern that how -- how things are going to be ten --20 Why should they be stuck to ten years from now? 21 something like -- as specific as this when we don't 22 know what -- what the situation's going to be ten 23 years from now? 24 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I guess because the

same reason I'm willing to proceed forward is on a

1 short-term basis which is based on everything we know 2 now this is the recommendation that's being made. 3 It may turn out if we know more in the 4 future that there would be a different recommendation 5 made, but we're -- but we're not allowing ourselves the opportunity to hear that changed condition at the 6 7 time we make the decision. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okav. And --9 and then my next question is what do we know now that would prompt us to impose this condition other than 10 DDOT recommended it? 11 12 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I don't have -- I mean I -- I think it makes -- I -- I can justify and 13 14 I don't want to testify. So, I'm not going to -- I'm 15 not going to other than what I suggested about the fact that Wisconsin Avenue is the more heavily 16 traveled street and that traffic is -- that vehicular 17 sounds are louder at night that -- which I would 18 19 presume would be part of the -- part of the rationale 20 underlying. 21 I -- I mean I don't -- I don't have 22 anything because as you said DDOT didn't explain it. 23 I just think it's a sound recommendation. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Also, clarifying 25 your comments, Ms. Mitten, about sound, I think I

1 absolutely understand your -- the -- the intent. 2 don't think that -- that the -- you -- you -- you 3 mentioned -- maybe this is more funny than anything 4 else, but you mentioned that it -- that the sound of 5 traffic is louder at night than it is during the day. Yes, I know, but -- and the perception. 6 7 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: It's perceived to 8 be. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Exactly. 10 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And that's exactly 11 where I'm going. 12 The reason why and I think you're exactly right. 13 14 You don't want a lot of noise at 10:00 at 15 night because you're relaxing and it's nighttime and it's in a residential area. 16 So, it seems to me if we look at the --17 what was presented in this that the DDOT and I would 18 19 have assumed that DDOT would want to disperse traffic 20 much more quickly than to have it all in one point and 21 all in one location which would essentially elongate 22 adverse condition, that that noise. Perhaps 23 potentially increase the time of backup. So, 24 integration of traffic coming out of the event and I'm

not so sure why two exits wouldn't disperse the

traffic more quickly, effectively and efficiently.

If -- if we look at taking it off the residential streets, I go back to what Ms. Miller was bringing up. Is that the evidence in the record shows that this whole area is surrounded by residential although Wisconsin is a larger traffic artillery or artery.

But, again, I think that with -- with the roads that are surrounding it it might be well served, two points, to quickly dissipate the traffic that's coming and going at that hour and to -- to -- to allow some flexibility as they change and as it's absolutely -- as it's actually implemented so that there might be some -- someway that we lend some flexibility in having DDOT look at it.

I would -- I would point the Board's direction to number -- Exhibit 54 with the applicant's submission Number 6 and I'm not clear. Maybe there's some clarity that can be brought, but the sixth paragraph in the center of it says "During the approval process for the parking garage, the District Department of Transportation concurred with the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation that two exits are needed to disperse traffic quickly and efficiently after cathedral events."

1 That seems to be saying well, why did they 2 say it in that position and here we have a different 3 position taken in terms of dispersal of events and 4 times. 5 So, again, I go back to it seems to me in -- in my limited experience of expert witnesses of 6 7 traffic engineering that are before us that have all 8 consistently said the more alternatives you have, the 9 less traffic impact you have. I'm not sure how I 10 could rely on DDOT's statement in isolation that says it would be better of if there's only one exit. 11 12 That's where I am. Others. MEMBER MANN: I agree with your position 13 14 on that. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Where are we then with additional information, edits on ten? 16 still have the language in terms of use or are we --17 and putting in flexibility with rare circumstances. 18 19 Are we ready to move on to 11, limitations on St. 20 Alban's? I think it might be expeditious to say that 21 the Board would look to -- to write in the intent of 22 the last sentence in -- in the performing arts center. 23 If I have a consensus on that, we -- we can write that 24 in as the intent that there might be some flexibility

in very extreme rare circumstances that utilization of

the arts center could be invoked. 1 2 Μy MEMBER ETHERLY: concern 3 entirely in agreement with the -- with the spirit of 4 -- of the language. My concern is getting into this 5 -- the -- the thicket of trying to determine exactly what -- you know, what -- what those circumstances 6 7 might be. What -- what would constitute them. As I said, I -- I appreciate the spirit of 8 I -- I would just rather rely on -- on -- on the 9 goodness and kindness of neighbors to be able to come 10 11 together and identify when those circumstances arise. 12 You know, no one's going to stand up and quote the text and -- and -- and language of a BZA order, but 13 14 rise to the occasion and do what needs to be done. 15 So, I -- I would be inclined just to stay away from that entirely. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think the 17 opposite. I think that the -- the language allows the 18 19 -- the neighbors and the school to come together and recognize that. I really find it hard to believe that 20 21 neighbors would be down here challenging, you know, 22 that kind of reaching out on a time of need. think when it's not in there, the school might be --23 24 I think it might be afraid to violate the order.

MEMBER ETHERLY:

25

I

I would disagree.

1 think we've seen just precisely the opposite and 2 definitely not -- do not allow. I think we've seen 3 just the opposite. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Where have we 5 seen the opposite? 6 MEMBER ETHERLY: I -- in terms of as you 7 used a particular reference or experience that we've 8 recently been confronted with here in the District and 9 I -- I just -- my concern is getting into the 10 difficulty of trying to determine when circumstances would exist. Is it -- you know, is it 11 a small fire at another school that would require. 12 it -- is it if construction's going on at a sister or 13 14 -- or neighboring institution. You know, is that a 15 set of -- a circumstance that would allow that to 16 happen? 17 What I meant to -- what I meant to state is -- is -- is clearly not that -- that I would expect 18 19 that there would be any concern or opposition from the 20 community in such an instance, but I just think it's a slippery slope to get into in terms of trying to 21 craft language for it. 22 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let me -- can I 24 make one other point here? Again, I don't think that

we have found that there is an objectionable condition

1	that needs to be mitigated and this is a condition
2	that's being proffered by the applicant. So, I'm not
3	sure what we're worried about. Again, I mean this
4	school has a history of years of operation here with
5	no well, I am sure there are some limitations, but
6	I don't know what they are. But, I don't think a
7	limitation on use of the performing arts center.
8	So so, we
9	MEMBER ETHERLY: Wait.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: you know,
11	what is a slippery slope that we're worried about. I
12	think, you know, we don't want them to rent out. I
13	think that's a big concern of neighbors and a
14	legitimate concern and that is put in here, but
15	they're not talking about renting out. They're
16	talking about they say rare. I mean maybe we can
17	craft it better, but
18	MEMBER ETHERLY: Oh, no. No, my my
19	apologies. I thought you were suggesting language
20	that was different from what was already included in
21	number ten.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh.
23	MEMBER ETHERLY: No, I'm entirely
24	comfortable with the language as it currently stands.
25	VICE CHAIRDERSON MILLER: Okay Good

124 1 Oh. 2 thought you MEMBER ETHERLY: Ι were 3 offering something different. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, good. Good. 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I didn't 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 7 understand that at all. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. 9 MEMBER ETHERLY: Here we go. Moving on. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think we're good. 11 MEMBER MANN: I actually see things 12 slightly differently and I'd like to offer this. At the moment, we have three fairly 13 14 ambiguous phrases in here, in rare circumstances, on 15 a limited basis and a compelling need and I see that almost in a similar way to the -- when we were talking 16 about enrollment allowing a 2 percent flexibility. 17 Well, if we took out the ambiguous phrases 18 19 and said the performing arts center may be made 20 available to non-PECF not for profit institution or 21 community organization for use of the performing arts 22 center that has suffered the loss of a -- use of a similar facility, request temporary relief from such 23

loss, then the only thing that we're lacking right

there is a number.

24

1	And so, the the whole thing I think
2	that the problem with this whole condition this
3	portion of the condition is that no matter how we
4	phrase that in rare circumstances, on a limited basis
5	or compelling need, it's completely open to
6	interpretation and without any number, I don't know
7	how that's going to be enforceable.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I think
9	that's very well done.
10	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Mr. Mann, would
13	you then suggest that we say everything that you said
14	leaving out those those ambiguous phrases and then
15	say something like no more than three days per year or
16	something?
17	MEMBER MANN: That would be the ideal
18	scenario if we are if we're able to come up with
19	that number, but I don't think that we can come up
20	with a number that's going to accurately reflect
21	potential conditions.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I I would
23	disagree. I mean I just think this is like a safety
24	valve and that if there was a pattern of making the
25	performing arts center available to non-profits or

1 whatever and not in emergency situations or 2 situations, then -- then there would be a record that they may have violated the order, but I think if we 3 4 just put it in rare situations, it's 5 understood. I don't think we can anticipate a number. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Agreed. 7 we're going to have to rely on the rationality of all involved to come to a clear understanding of temporary 8 if such rare circumstances do arise and I think Mr. 9 Mann's compromise suggestion in editing out some of 10 the more nondescriptive language in there puts it 11 12 There's clearly a loss. directly, too. There's a similar type of facility that is obviously in need and 13 14 that temporary need could be provided for through the 15 performing arts center. 16 Unless there's major objection, 17 suggest that we move on now. Okay. Let's go to 11 which goes 18 19 limitations of the use of the athletic fields. 20 St. Alban's would schedule not. 21 simultaneous scrimmages or games with other schools on 22 the athletic fields with the following exceptions and 23 those are the smaller of the tennis matches, the makeup games canceled due to inclement weather or other 24 25 similar unanticipated events.

1 Mr. Mann will have a comment on that 2 phrase. St. 3 Additionally, Alban's will not 4 schedule more than five athletic tournaments involving 5 more than one visiting school per year on its athletic fields. 6 7 The -- the substantive of that, I think that was very well addressed in the -- as most of 8 9 these were, but this specifically in the hearing and I know that we had specific direct questions trying to 10 11 anticipate what kind of events and tournaments might 12 simultaneously be done and this seems to be appropriate limitation on those. 13 14 But, other comments. 15 MEMBER MANN: I think it's largely 16 justified as it's written and I would suggest saying 17 the following exceptions: one, tennis matches and two, make-up games. It doesn't matter why they're 18 19 canceled. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Right. Yes, 21 and -- and I was a bit perplexed by what other similar 22 unanticipated events would be. It's probably going to 23 be a game of some sort that had to be made and if it's 24 unanticipated, then it's probably a make up. Right?

Okay.

Good enough.

1	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think it's I
2	think that other unanticipated events is modifying the
3	the cause of the cancellation.
4	MEMBER MANN: Right.
5	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: The cancellation
6	could be canceled the the game could be canceled
7	because of inclement weather or some other thing that
8	caused it to be canceled.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, even more recent
10	to take it out.
11	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: More reason to take
12	it out?
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, I mean why
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, then somebody
15	can say well, that game was canceled because of the
16	sniper. It wasn't canceled because of a rain storm.
17	So, you can't make it up. That's what you wouldn't
18	want to
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Exactly.
20	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: So, I think it's
21	I think the the language as it is fine.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I agree. I
23	don't know why we change it.
24	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And just for the
25	just to add to it, the ANC doesn't object to it. They

1	are happy.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. But, isn't
3	isn't Mr. Mann being rational in saying a make-up
4	game that's canceled is a make-up game that's canceled
5	which would be the exception. Why do we care why it
6	was canceled?
7	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Oh. Oh. Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, he's scratching
9	the whole thing.
10	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, what would it
11	say? Just
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It would say the
13	following
14	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Make-up games.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: exceptions, one,
16	tennis matches and two, make-up games.
17	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Oh, yes, I like
18	that.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. Good. Less is
20	more.
21	Twelve, limitations on non-school uses of
22	athletic fields during academic year, I'm not going to
23	read the entire thing. It's in front of us.
24	Comments on this.
25	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: This this was one

place where when you get into the -- sort of the mechanics of it and you're giving permission someone, a non-school entity to use the facility, I think this is an opportunity where you would want to have similar language that you have in number seven which is that you would have this agreement and it would require compliance with the parking policy and the noncompliance with the parking policy might result in revocation of the permission to use the -- the athletic fields. And I think we had talked about that during the hearing and I -- I think the applicant indicated when -- when we were talking through it that they wouldn't have a problem with that. So, I would just advocate for some additional language that sort of captures all that parking stuff in -- in a -- in a similar way as is -- as is captured in number seven. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I do recall the same testimony on question and answer and in the hearing and what you're saying is look if you're -you're offering this, let's call it amenity, then there are responsibilities in -- in -- in being able to utilize that. Ms. Miller, nothing?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I -- I just

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	wanted to be clear what she was saying, but I think I
2	understand that. It's the same kind of provisions
3	that we wanted in number eight. Was it eight?
4	Visitors coming.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's seven.
6	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Seven.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Seven.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It's seven in terms
9	of what in terms of having disciplinary actions or
10	in fact, maybe revoke until you go into a level of
11	revoking the ability to utilize the fields. I'm not
12	saying that's what we're going to put in the
13	conditions.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I I don't
15	do we want to jump into their disciplinary action
16	again?
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, that's not what
18	I'm saying.
19	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: No. No.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, there would be
21	some sort of the I think what Ms. Mitten is
22	saying is that if you're providing this ability to use
23	the field, then you have you have some force in
24	implementing what you require them to do whether it be
25	behavioral or whether it be parking, whether it be

1 time of use. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. 3 why I was looking to number eight where -- which 4 addressed visitor parking. That they would be subject 5 to the same types of restrictions. The parking be 6 designated on the -- on the close or something for 7 visitors. 8 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Right. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Or for these 10 teams or whatever. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Right. And I guess 11 12 what -- what I'm -- there's -- well, there's two things. One is visiting teams are not the same as the 13 14 entities contemplated in number 12 and in number 13. 15 So, when you have visiting teams, you're 16 saying look, there's the parking. We provided you 17 some parking. Go park over there. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. 19 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: This one would be 20 okay, you're some outside entity unrelated to the 21 You're not competing with the school. school. Wе 22 have a use agreement and part of that is you -- you 23 agree -- you the -- you the -- the non-school user 24 agree to comply with certain things and that would

include our parking policy and if you don't, then

1 the -- the agreement's subject to revocation due to 2 noncompliance. 3 That's the teeth to -- to capture that --4 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Their agreement 5 with for instance the coach and the team that's allowed to practice on -- on the fields. Is that what 6 7 you mean? 8 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: If that's a non-9 school use. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: If they violate the parking, that you're suggesting that they then not 11 be allowed to use the field or something like that in 12 the future? 13 14 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: That that -- that 15 that be one possible mechanism for enforcing the --16 the parking policy. 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We're suggesting that this -- St. Alban's would establishing the 18 19 enforcement, the -- the -- the disciplinary action, 20 but you want a disciplinary action stated within this. 21 Is that correct? COMMISSIONER MITTEN: 22 No, I mean in the 23 same way that I didn't want to get into the minutia of 24 how the school does their business when we were 25 talking about saying something like seven,

1	disciplinary action or whatever suggests that there
2	will be a consequence
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
4	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: for
5	noncompliance.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, are you looking
7	for us to prescribe that consequence?
8	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: No.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. That's
10	that's the only clarification I was trying to bring.
11	I think that raised some concern here.
12	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: But, the I guess
13	the only thing just for the same reason that I
14	liked number seven, originally I liked number seven,
15	I mean I still like number seven as it was written.
16	Which, you know, if you take that last clause of
17	number seven which says to the child, if you don't
18	comply, then non-renewal of you know, we may not
19	renew your contract. I would like to also say to the
20	you know, the non-school user and we may not let
21	you use our fields anymore if you don't comply. It's
22	not that we won't. It's just that we might not.
23	I I just like that to be there because
24	that's sort of the strongest action the school can
25	take.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It's possible 2 though that we could say something like that this is 3 subject to the same -- they're subject to the same 4 parking requirements as, you know, set forth in this 5 order or whatever and it would be St. Alban's that would be maybe in violation if these teams violated 6 7 those parking provisions. I think it's a good idea if they -- if 8 9 they answer to some kind of an enforcement, but I'm not sure how to phrase it here unless we say that they 10 11 should institute some kind of enforcement which is 12 general because we're not going to say what that enforcement is going to be. 13 14 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Here's how I would 15 -- this is just a off the top of my head adaptation of number seven which is that St. Alban's will require 16 each non-school user of its athletic fields to agree 17 to the parking policy when the non-school user signs 18 19 its use -- usage agreement. Non-school users who violate the school's 20 21 parking policy will be subject to disciplinary action 22 which may include non-renewal of the use agreement or 23 something like that. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I quess 25 where I'm at right now is I think it's -- I like your

beginning that they shall, you know, sign an agreement 1 2 that they'll comply with the parking requirements, but then I just don't -- I hesitate when we jump into like 3 4 disciplinary action or something as a result. 5 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: We're not telling 6 them what to do. We're just telling them they can't 7 do nothing. You know, it's -- because if you say --8 it's okay -- if you don't say it, then it's okay to do 9 nothing and then -- then you don't have a real condition, an enforceable condition. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 11 Okay. I just 12 want to back up one more step. Again, I'm not sure that we even had objectionable conditions that we're 13 14 trying to mitigate. So, that we need to be cautious 15 when we get into requiring disciplinary action. I don't know. Maybe it could be in their 16 TMP and -- and if that TMP has flexibility to add 17 things that would cover this. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is it in the TMP? 20 I mean I don't see us as having a procedure to include 21 it in it unless we throw all these conditions out and 22 adopt Mr. Mann's recommendation. 23 What does it state, Mr. Mann? 24 MEMBER MANN: It states almost the exact 25 same thing as the condition.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. I -- what 2 I'm saying is is it in the TMP that there's actually 3 disciplinary action if the non-PECF users violate the 4 parking policy? 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know. I -- I just think the onus should be on the school and 6 7 maybe -- I mean it has here that they should direct them to parking places. Maybe we should add that they 8 9 should provide parking for them and -- and direct 10 them. 11 I just don't know that we have evidence 12 that rises to the level of, you know, getting into disciplinary action against visitors or the kids for 13 14 the soccer. I mean I understand what you're saying. I think it's a good policy. If -- if you have someone 15 using your fields violating your -- your parking 16 17 provisions, then they should be subject to cancellation, but whether we want to impose that is --18 19 is another story. 20 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I quess my feeling 21 is just to go back to sort of the general statement is 22 if you believe that the parking policy -- if you 23 believe that the parking policy is -- should be a -should be a condition of the BZA order so that yes, we 24

want there to be these controls, it's important that

they be there to mitigate existing adverse impacts or

potential adverse impacts or likely adverse impacts.

If you go back to that threshold question,

then for each set of users, potential users, where you

have the opportunity to have a mechanism to require compliance with that parking policy, I think we should avail ourselves of that opportunity. Because then you're saying we're not just gesturing at it saying good idea, hope it works. We're saying it's important

10 enough to us that we help you make it work.

So, that's -- that's kind of the -- the theme that I've been trying to advocate which is do it with the students, do it with the non-school users, do it with whoever you can by whatever -- you know, if you have an agreement with them, a written agreement with them.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Just want to say that's exactly my -- my dilemma here. You know, I agree with if you're going to have conditions, you should have teeth to enforce them or what good are they, but on the other hand, we -- we haven't -- when have conditions normally, they are because we find a problem that has to be solved and addressed and do we find that this is a problem that has to be addressed

1	that way.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Or is it
3	anticipation of a potential problem?
4	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. Let's
5	let's let's leave parking aside for just a second
6	and go back to the what I had said when we started
7	which I think is the secondary purpose of this order
8	which is to sort of capture existing the existing
9	understandings and existing conditions and say we want
10	the status quo to be maintained. If if if you
11	believe that we okay, there's not adverse impact
12	being we're not addressing an existing adverse
13	impact. So, why are we having a condition? Why would
14	be have a parking policy, everything's fine. So,
15	forget parking now.
16	With that in mind, why would be address
17	enrollment? There's no problem about enrollment.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, but the
19	reason we address enrollment, it was proffered by the
20	applicant and I think makes sense is that if there's
21	no limitation on it whatsoever, you know, it could
22	like triple say and then that would create a problem.
23	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Um-hum.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So, the school

is saying -- they don't -- they don't mind saying

1 we'll be subject to this enrollment because we have no 2 plans whatsoever to increase. This is -- this is --3 this is the right capacity for the school, the program 4 and so, we can deal with these numbers and given these 5 numbers, this is what happens with parking spaces or 6 given these numbers, this is what happens with 7 performances. 8 So, I think those numbers are pretty 9 You know, if you doubled the numbers, important. 10 maybe you -- you might double the performances or something I mean --11 12 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Um-hum. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 13 -- and the 14 parking spaces. So, that -- that's where I am on the 15 numbers. COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. And so, what 16 I -- what I -- how I would extend that is they're 17 saying look, this -- this works for us. So, we don't 18 19 have a problem proffering the condition 20 enrollment. 21 Same thing with parking policies. 22 They've had a parking policy and so, works for us. 23 we're -- we're fine with proffering the Board that the 24 parking policy works. We're willing to prove to you

that we -- we're -- that it -- it works.

25

We'll make

1 work. The community need not fear because we're going 2 to have this -- this provision in agreements to make 3 sure that it works. It works today. That it continue 4 to work into the future. 5 I -- I think that it's the same kind of a thing where we're trying to capture and insure that 6 7 the status quo does not deteriorate. To me, it's the 8 same thing. 9 MEMBER MANN: Do you think that condition 10 number 12 is specifically trying to address parking issues only or parking issues and non-parking issues? 11 12 Because it seems that it's to me addressing more than just parking. 13 I mean we've got 14 a sentence in here that talks about the use of the 15 fields and then it says that those users that don't have zone three parking will do something. 16 17 says that they'll be permitted to use the fields subject to certain things or except as follows and (a) 18 19 is one thing and (b) is back to parking and then (c) 20 and (d) are not. 21 So, do you think the intention of this is 22 solely to deal with parking or to deal with parking 23 and other issues? 24 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: No, I think 12 and 25 13 are both about dealing with the -- all the aspects

1 of use of the athletic fields by non-school users and 2 one of those elements is parking. MEMBER MANN: So, parking in one 3 Okay. 4 alterative could be that everything to do with parking 5 or traffic could be taken out of that so that that's dealt with separately as a parking or traffic --6 7 transportation issue and the only thing that you're left with then is the actual utilization of the 8 9 facilities. 10 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm sorry. I don't -- I don't -- I didn't -- I didn't follow 11 12 significance of what you're what you I just didn't get it. 13 suggesting? 14 MEMBER MANN: It ties back into 15 original suggestion that transportation management can be addressed holistically under a transportation 16 17 management program and then we can enforce transportation management without precluding 18 19 enforcement of how particular facilities are used regardless of their traffic conditions. 20 21 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I quess the reason 22 that -- that I was suggesting this approach is because 23 whatever you want to say, whatever you want 24 condition for a non-school user like, you know, your

-- the use -- your use has to end by a certain time

1	and whatever, that that they would have a use
2	agreement that sort of outlines different provisions
3	and one of those provisions would relate to the
4	parking policy.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: How about St.
6	Alban's shall be required to enter into a use
7	agreement with non-PECF users that requires them to
8	comply with their TMP or something like that?
9	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And if we could add
10	in noncompliance may result in revocation of such an
11	of the use agreement that
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I guess see
13	my problem here is that I know that this we know
14	from the evidence that this activity has been going on
15	for years without objectionable conditions being at
16	least brought to my attention in the hearing. So, why
17	do we need to take that additional step about
18	revocation?
19	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, we did have
20	testimony that there are adverse impacts. You you
21	might not you might not agree with the the
22	severity of them or or
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: From this type
24	of use by the non-PECF users?
25	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Yes, that's the

1 ANC speaks to that. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Mann, Ms. 3 Miller, let me ask you if we were to add in a clause 4 12, whatever it would be, E that indicated that some 5 of the language that Ms. Mitten has offered looking at seven that noncompliance with the proper parking 6 7 procedures would result in some disciplinary action, 8 if possible revocation of the use of the fields, if 9 that was added into here or was added into a transportation management plan, that's not the issue 10 11 or is it? 12 Actually, for Mr. Mann, because is this -is the substance of what's being said an issue or 13 14 where it shows up? 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: To me, it's --16 it's what they do. I mean I think that that's a 17 problem that the school has with a user. I think it's violating the provisions of the BZA order. What is it 18 19 going to do about it? Is it going to revoke the usage 20 agreement? Is it going to assess penalties? 21 going to -- I don't know. I just kind of feel like 22 why do we need to address what it's going to be. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, Ms. -- Ms. 24 Mitten hasn't -- I haven't heard her indicating such

detailed disciplinary action, but rather that there

1	would be some disciplinary action.
2	I understand that you're saying well, how
3	do we hold accountable these non-users or summertime
4	users and put the school at jeopardy, but here's the
5	nexus that I see. The school is somehow prospering,
6	whatever that means, but prospering by allowing
7	utilization of their field and with that, they also
8	have a responsibility in order in the larger
9	community.
10	So, I don't have much difficulty in
11	saying, you know, they probably ought to, you know,
12	make sure that everyone using the the facilities
13	behaves.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I guess
15	I feel like the onus should be on on St. Alban's,
16	but
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And it is.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: St. Alban's
19	would be in violation if it's if if these users
20	are in violation.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And they are. They
22	would be violation if they allowed the continued
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Why don't we
24	leave it at that?
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: use.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I mean if the
non-users violated, St. Alban's would be in violation
and I mean, therefore, the neighbors or whoever would
have redress because St. Alban's would be in violation
of the order and leave it up to St. Alban's as to how
they want to make sure these non-users I mean these
non-PECF users comply.
I mean I certainly want to add that they
would be these these non-users non-PECF users
would be subject to the same TMP policy, the same
requirements of this order.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And that's
where we are then.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Okay. Can I just?
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm I'm I
could go in that direction, but we would have to alter
like number three for instance which sort of seems to
capture what the requirement is and then we go
later, we say how you how you enforce that policy.
So, number three says St. Alban's will
require faculty, staff and students who drive to
school and who don't have the the RPP sticker to
park on the close including the parking garage. Okay.
Well then we'd then have to extend that to non-school

б

users of athletic fields and so on and then -- then 1 2 you can say that non-compliant -- and they can -- they 3 can figure out how to -- they can -- how they enforce 4 it, but that I think if we extend, you know, include 5 in a number three non-school users of athletic fields, 6 then you can go there where you want to -- where you 7 want to go. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I agree. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, I'm sorry. 10 there seems to be an offer that Ms. Mitten we wouldn't have included in 12 and 13, but rather in three. But, 11 have a language that would be inclusive of three and 12 12 and 13. 13 14 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Right. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. It's I haven't lost, Mr. Mann, your issue that 16 we'll revisit towards the end which we'll -- we'll do 17 with all these. 18 19 So, 13, are there any other --20 other comments on 13 which goes to the limitation of 21 the non-school use of athletic fields during the non-22 academic year? These are the -- the summertime. 23 seems to be closely linked to 12 with unless being 24 used by St. Alban's, the track shall be available for

public use subject to any restrictions placed on use

by St. Alban's.

Anything else on that? Additions? Concerns?

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I mean I just want to note for the record I -- I think that the ANC offered more restrictive conditions, but I don't think that the evidence in our hearings showed that they were necessary. That again -- that -- that the school's been operating without any limitations for all these years and this is the first time I think that they're putting limitations upon themselves. I don't think there's evidence in the record that further limitations should be necessary.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. I think we need to keep it in perspective although a lot of times these conditions take on larger than life proportions of the emphasis that we put it, but I -- it's pretty clear to me that hearing the testimony and I think that we all understand the fact that the -- the primarily use of these is for the school and that there are times where I think that the evidence and the testimony was -- for instance, if a -- if a coach has a -- has a -- a team of participants that aren't all St. Alban's, they use the field, it isn't as if this is tournament central and just being more

1 utilized for outside, but --2 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I want to back 3 up though and correct myself a little bit. In -- in 4 dealing with the athletic fields, if something is a different, 5 little bit Ι mean they're being reconfigured and -- and the bleachers are going to 6 7 hold more people. So, then there was a question about noise and to that effect is number one and I think 8 that the evidence in the record showed that -- that 9 the noise would not rise to a -- a level that would be 10 objectionable. 11 12 And then there was a question about traffic. Would -- would -- because the bleachers 13 14 would hold more people would -- would it attract more 15 cars and what I got from the hearing was that no, the same events are going to be held, for instance, you 16 17 know, if there's a homecoming or whatever, it's the 18 same event. It attracts the same amount of people and 19 that for the most part, they're just going to be 20 accommodated more comfortably. CHAIRPERSON Okay. Good. 21 GRIFFIS: 22 Correction. Clarification? 23 Fourteen, limitations of amplified noise. 24 Comments? Edits? Corrections?

I don't think it reasonable just to keep

1 in language that St. Alban's shall take reasonable 2 steps to minimize noise to -- to the neighborhood from 3 events on athletic fields. I think that the evidence 4 in the record shows that the orientation and the 5 setback and the field layout have taken that into consideration and I don't know -- as has been well 6 7 said by Mr. Mann this morning, how do we actually -where's the clarity of that in measurable aspect for 8 9 the enforceability of it? 10 No use of lighting on the athletic fields at any time. I think we can change the language there 11 for exactly what was presented in the evidence and 12 that is that they are not providing athletic field 13 14 illumination. Clearly, we're not getting into any 15 sort of safety lighting along pathways or anything of 16 that sense. So, we need to put language in there that indicates that they would not be able to illuminate 17 the fields with light. 18 19 Okay. Anything else? 20 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Are we --21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 22 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: -- are we 23 thought -- I thought they had agreed to -- that there 24 would be no amplified sound and it doesn't sa that.

It says they'll take reasonable steps to minimize

1	noise and that they'll not use any lighting except for
2	safety lighting. It doesn't say they won't have
3	amplified sound.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good point to bring
5	up. I wasn't clear on that because I thought they had
6	indicated that there would be some amplification of
7	the announcing of the athletics.
8	How do you do that otherwise?
9	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: You don't have an
LO	announcer. You just have people follow the game.
L1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Are you all looking
L2	at that?
L3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What?
L4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 3D. Amplified.
L5	Amplified.
L6	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: They do make
L7	reference to an announcer calling the game for their
L8	at least for their homecoming football game. So,
L9	they do they do use an announcer from at least
20	part of the time.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The issue before us
22	right now for discussion is just whether there is
23	limitation on the amplified noise, whether there's
24	limitation on the announcing of the athletic events.
25	Ms. Mitten has brought it to the

1 attention. I just need to hear if there is comment on 2 that. 3 I'm not sure. Are you advocating -- I think -- I didn't understand you to be 4 5 advocating one direction or other, but bringing it to attention for discussion. 6 7 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I had it in my head that they were not going to have amplified sound. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 10 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And that's clearly not the case and I don't know that I'm going to 11 advocate for anything. I just want -- I just had it 12 in my head that they had. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Others have My recollection was that that 15 other recollections. was an initiative brought forth that we were going to 16 Then I will stop trying to pull 17 prohibit. Okay. teeth on this end and move on to 15. 18 19 Tennis club parking, St. Alban's shall 20 direct members, the required staff and employees on 21 the -- the tennis club who do not have valid zone 22 parking permits to park in those 23 identified in condition number three when they drive 24 to St. Alban's tennis courts. Again, directing

members.

Comment?

1 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Can we -- the only 2 comment I would have is can we add tennis club patrons 3 to the list in three? So, we have students, faculty, 4 staff, non-school users of athletic fields and tennis 5 club patrons. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. I don't 6 7 have any disagreement with that unless others do. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I just want 9 to clarify what -- what we're doing here. 10 don't understand why tennis club patrons are even addressed. I don't remember hearing anything. 11 guess because they're in the population that arrives 12 I didn't hear any 13 at the campus. I guess so. 14 testimony that -- that they were a problem. 15 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I -- I thought that 16 they were a problem for the relatively small subset of 17 the community that's approximate to where the tennis courts are. That's what I remember hearing about. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I mean I 20 -- you know, I think -- I think it's -- I think it's, 21 you know, pretty good for the staff and employees, but 22 -- and I think that when you say direct members, it's 23 -- it's -- it doesn't have -- this doesn't have teeth 24 and -- and I think we should recognize that. 25 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There's -the

1	requirement here and the enforceabilities that St.
2	Alban's would have directed.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That's right.
4	That they it's like encourage them. Direct and
5	encourage them.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It's a bit of an
7	unamplified
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It's not like
9	the people are going to be arrested if they park on
10	the public street though.
11	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Well, I think it's
12	you know, there's there's
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Like the BZA
14	police. Right.
15	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: there's two
16	things. One is if they you know, if they have a
17	valid RPP sticker, they're entitled to park in the
18	street and then if they don't, they're entitled to
19	park there for two hours. You know, it's sort of like
20	whatever. I don't know how long a tennis game is, but
21	okay.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Depends. If Mr.
23	Etherly's playing, you better watch out.
24	Okay. Well, I think the intent is is
25	is a consensus from the Board and we'll figure out

how we actually perform that in 15.

Sixteen, use and parking liaison committee, there was some indication from the ANC to be very prescriptive. There is opposition to that. It's before us whether there is one, not or what the layout should be. Right now, the applicant is proffering the condition that they would provide a contact person and contact information.

Additions? Edits? Concerns?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I think typically with committees like this we have -- we have taken a -- you know, sort of the broad brush approach and not got into trying to micro-manage who's going to be on it and how many times they're going to meet and who's going to keep the minutes and all of that. So, I -- I think that the condition as it's proffered is fine.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I tend to agree. In fact, we run into great difficulty if we get too far beyond what's actually stated here. Quite frankly, St. Alban's would provide a contact point number, e-mail address for neighbors who wish to report any failure to comply with the usage parking conditions therein. The last sentence is sufficient for my consideration.

However, I don't object to that only in

1 the first part which would be the establishment of an 2 neighborhood liaison committee and that would be compose as the St. Alban's and the --3 neighbors decide on their own. 4 5 Okay. Anything else on 16? Then we're at 17 which is the last of the 6 7 applicant's proffered conditions which was going to 8 coordination with DDOT. Routinely requesting that 9 DDOT and other appropriate D.C. agencies enforce parking restrictions in the immediate neighborhood and 10 also that St. Alban's would work with DDOT to study 11 appropriate garage exit points for PAC events. 12 Comments? Concerns? 13 14 Okav. Ιf there isn't anything 15 additionally, then Mr. Mann's last item I think we ought to revisit or do you have additional --16 Well, yes, I 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: mean in general I think that the ANC raised an 18 19 important concern and I -- I believe OP may have acted 20 as well and -- and that -- and I -- I share it to some 21 extent and I just want to raise it for discussion. 22 And -- and that is that this new parking 23 lot is being presented as the answer to parking 24 congestion in the neighborhood, but there really --

there really isn't teeth or whatever as far as I can

1 tell with respect to people using it. We've got these 2 conditions that say shall require or shall direct or, you know, I don't really know the force of those. 3 4 And -- and I found it a little bit 5 disconcerting that the Cathedral made some representations that it was going to be charging for 6 7 use of this lot to its parents, et cetera. What I -- what I would like -- I don't 8 9 believe that, you know, it rises to the level of conditions per se, but I would like to -- I think to 10 encourage the close to create incentives for its 11 12 visitors in particular to use the lot as a first I think that if they're charging for it, it 13 14 may not be a first resort. The first resort may be 15 the neighborhood which is what the neighborhood -neighbors were complaining about in this proceeding. 16 So, I think that -- I just think that 17 there are creative ways. Perhaps if the close could 18 19 look at that. Is charging -- I know that St. Alban's 20 may have to pay its fair share of this garage, but 21 perhaps charges could be done in different ways such 22 as surcharges on tuition or -- or charges for the lot, 23 incorporated in the ticket for the performance or 24 whatever it is.

So, to try to create a situation where the

lot is the first resort and not the second resort.

I just wanted to throw that out. I think it's a legitimate concern, but I don't think that -- that we have enough evidence per se unless other people can identify it to actually require that the school do that. So.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Good point. Comments? Reactions?

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I -- I guess I agree with Ms. Miller first of all that we shouldn't -- we can't incorporate it in the conditions, but it's --It's -- it's a big concern and I'm it's a concern. sure it's a concern for the school or the whole -- you know, all the -- all the entities. Because they need to recover the investment someway and it's a question of how they're going to do that and when you have a neighborhood that's basically, you know, to put it, you know, simply full of free parking and then you charge discreetly for parking, that's -- that's -that discourages people. So, if there's more creative ways about building the charges in and saying the ticket costs you a little bit more, but your parking is free, then, you know, maybe people would be more inclined to park in the garage. So, I think that's a But, it's a -- it's going to be a good suggestion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

challenge for all of them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, I think it's a -- is a very excellent point and it's going to be a challenge. I -- some of the issues of not being in the condition also arise to the fact that this is a shared situation and -- and us putting the onus on one entity, St. Alban's, that doesn't control the financial or the -- the actual specifics of that is very difficult, but it should be very clear and so, I think it was very well stated that it is certainly a part if not strongly recommended from the Board that some provision be made to have no instant cost for parking in this. So, that it is the first choice not a -- a secondary thought of whether one should pay or find something else first.

Okay. Anything else then on this? Specific conditions, other elements.

I want to just very briefly bring up Mr. Mann's point again so that we don't -- and -- and -- and if -- if I understand it correctly, what Mr. Mann is advocating is the conditions that would incorporate essentially three through 17 could be consolidated into one paragraph indicating that this St. Alban's would maintain and implement a transportation management plan and that would -- that would cover all

1 of the conditions that followed. 2 Is that appropriately stated, Mr. Mann? 3 **MEMBER** MANN: That is appropriately 4 stated. just believe that that's somewhat 5 enforceable condition and allows greater flexibility to deal with changing conditions in the future, but I 6 7 don't think that I need to say much more than that. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Good. 9 think that's very clear. Let me have some comments 10 and reactions to that. MEMBER ETHERLY: And it would be your 11 understanding that the substance of those conditions 12 that are being -- that would be condensed into that 13 14 one condition would that still somehow or someway be included in the text of this order? I mean how do you 15 16 retain that substance that we just went through in that one condition? 17 Substance regarding --18 MEMBER MANN: 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think what he's 20 getting to is how would we reference it? If five 21 years from now someone picks up this order and say 22 okay, we want to enforce this condition and it's --23 there -- there is to be maintained and implemented 24 transportation management item one, where do we go for

it and two, what's in it?

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do we ever 2 require an applicant to update the BZA on a year 3 basis? I think sometimes we do with enrollment 4 numbers, but -- because are you talking about having 5 these general conditions, but also that they might be subject to change because -- if there's TMP subject to 6 7 change? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, I think that's 8 what Mr. Mann and I won't think for him, but --9 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- my understanding 12 is that yes, that there would be flexibility. That I think is a good point, but also raises some major 13 14 concern from me and I think that's what Mr. Etherly 15 was going to. Is okay, if you take it all out, well, where is it and how do we know what's to happen and 16 17 what isn't to happen? What do you think, Mr. --18 19 MEMBER MANN: I think that's a legitimate answer what would be in 20 question, but to the 21 transportation management plan would be something akin 22 to conditions that would be designed to provide 23 answers to the neighborhood that the school would 24 continue to operate reasonably and in conformance with

Section 206.

1 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um. 2 I'm opposed, Mr. Chair. MEMBER ETHERLY: 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Others. 4 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: I'm with Mr. 5 Etherly. I really think that there's a certain amount even 6 specificity that's required to 7 enforcement and to give the -- I mean we basically would be giving the applicant complete discretion on 8 9 the content of the transportation management plan and that's just -- given that -- given that the core of 10 this is all about parking and traffic, I would -- I --11 I would just really be troubled by that. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Others. 13 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So -- so, my 15 understanding is if -- if we have an order with the conditions and then there's the TMP attached as an 16 17 exhibit, not attached as an exhibit, what -- that the -- that there's a separate TMP, that that TMP could be 18 19 changed at a later date provided that it wasn't 20 inconsistent with our order. Okay. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, Mr. Mann. 22 MEMBER MANN: No, I can understand that --23 that differing viewpoints and the advantages and 24 disadvantages of that sort of scenario and while it

might not be something that's adopted with this order,

1 I just think that these items need to be taken into 2 consideration in the future regarding the 3 enforceability of conditions. 4 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent and -- and 5 I think that's well said, Mr. Mann. I -- I fully I know the 6 understand what your intent is here. 7 intent is to look at this, as you indicated, 8 holistically. 9 I mean we have this plan, this management How do we actually get this done and have --10 11 lend itself to the flexibility and is it by not conditioning all the specificity, but putting it all 12 into one document that is implemented and maintained. 13 14 I think you're absolutely correct in going 15 in that direction. I think it's not appropriate at this juncture in this specific application at this 16 time, but -- and I know the Board will keep in mind 17 that frame when next week visits a similar situation 18 19 and ask for that perhaps ahead of time and really 20 phrase our -- perhaps our decisions or at least our 21 deliberation and submissions on that. 22 COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Can I -- can I just 23 make a --24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 25 I just want to make COMMISSIONER MITTEN:

1 two comments. One is that in PUDs in particular, we 2 often have a stand-alone transportation management 3 plan that sort of, you know, it's vetted on its own 4 and then references made to compliance with it, but 5 that becomes a fixed thing. So, that if the applicant wants to depart from it, they have to come back. It's 6 7 not that they're given discretion to modify it on 8 their own. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Good point 10 and we've always had difficulty in -- in how incorporate it in our orders and we have gone to 11 actually adopting it as a finding of fact that it is 12 in existence and maintain and implement it, but I 13 14 think that brings an interesting point of whether there's a vehicle for the Board and an order to say 15 that there's this stand-alone document that -- that 16 17 should be implemented. Okay. That being said, is there anything 18 19 else on this application, statements, conditions, 20 deliberation, comments. 21 We have one more issue in this. 22 Ms. Miller, did you have an additional 23 I thought Ms. -- Ms. Miller does not have issue? 24 another issue.

We have -- the one outstanding issue that

we had not as I understood been decisive on and that's condition number one going to the phasing. So, let's revisit that just briefly and then we can move ahead as I think everything else is in order here and there is a motion. It's been seconded and condition -- so, we're looking at condition number one which goes to whether the performing shall start within ten years of the issuance of this order.

COMMISSIONER MITTEN: Since Ι was advocating for that, I'll -- I'll just maybe say I --I -- I didn't get the sense that I was getting any support for my position. So, I'm not going to press it other than to say that I'm going to vote in favor of the motion as -- and with the condition as it stands, but -- but I just want to be on record and -and say again to the BZA that, you know, there's -there's a lot of reasons why one does not approve something that may be built ten years in advance because it gives you the opportunity to revisit the background conditions and, you know, one of closing statements that Ms. Miller made had to do with the operation of the parking garage and that we hope this will be the parking choice of first resort, but we don't know.

So, that's among the reasons why I was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	suggesting that it would worthwhile to have them if
2	they if they can't, in fact, build it sooner, that
3	they would come back and we would see perhaps how the
4	parking garage was operating, but I just as a
5	general principle, I'm I'm concerned about
6	approving things like this with such a a broad
7	window.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Others.
9	Comments. It's not required.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I just want
11	to make sure that there wasn't something we were going
12	to come back to that we haven't come back to. Is that
13	possible?
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Could be.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We've spent hours on
17	this already. I think that did I think that was
18	that was the last condition that I had stated that we
19	were going back to.
20	MEMBER ETHERLY: Just just for the sake
21	of clarity, did we did we put to bed the issue of
22	the single the single Wisconsin Avenue exit for
23	performing arts center performances that end after a
24	certain time? That was discussion pursuant to on my

notes condition number -- what was formerly condition

1	number ten on page 16 of 19 at Exhibit Number 64.
2	Just a question of use of the Wisconsin
3	Avenue exit as the sole exit for performances ending
4	after a certain point.
5	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: My recollection is
6	that that was another occasion where I was
7	unsuccessful in advocating my position.
8	MEMBER ETHERLY: I would be inclined to
9	agree with you. To make sure that we had touched upon
LO	it.
L1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. That was
L2	not added.
L3	MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
L4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: As I understood, 17
L5	stood also in terms of that review for that time.
L6	Okay. If there's nothing else that is in
L7	the recollection of the body, then we do have the
L8	motion before us. It has been seconded and
L9	conditioned. I would ask that all of you in favor of
20	the motion signify by saying aye.
21	(Ayes.)
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Opposed?
23	Abstaining?
24	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: And, Mr. Chairman,
25	iust before

	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS. Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER MITTEN: the vote is
3	called, that's just to clarify and that's sort of
4	with the changes that we agreed to by consensus.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm sorry. Yes,
6	absolutely so and what this will do is just for our
7	procedure and actually for the public so they
8	understand it, we have all of us taken notes. Staff
9	has also been taking notes. We will consolidate all
10	of those as a draft goes around to the Board's review.
11	That draft will then go back for final review and then
12	issuance. So, we will make sure that all of our
13	comments and edits are are are put into the
14	final order.
15	Very well. Anything else on this? Mr.
16	Moy, if you wouldn't mind just recording the vote.
17	SECRETARY MOY: No, sir, very happy to.
18	The Board voted on the motion of Mr. Etherly to
19	approve the application with conditions as stated by
20	the consensus of the Board. Seconded by the Chair,
21	Mr. Griffis. Also, in support of the motion, Ms.
22	Miller, Mr. Mann and Ms. Mitten. The vote of 5 to 0
23	to 0.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Thank you
25	very much, Mr. Moy.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.

1	I think it's appropriate for me to update
2	our schedule at this time. It's getting close to
3	unfortunately 1:25. We are halfway through our
4	morning meeting. We have two addition decisions to
5	make. We are going to need to take at least a 20-
6	minute break at this point and come back. I don't
7	anticipate taking more than an hour on those two
8	decisions and then we would move right into the
9	afternoon.
10	What what I would anticipate doing is
11	going straight in after our meeting to the first
12	couple of cases cases in the afternoon that have
13	preliminary matters and trying to get through those
14	preliminary matters and then we would assess whether
15	there would be time for the Board to take a quick
16	lunch break. So, for that, the afternoon session,
17	those that are here for it, I would anticipate that we
18	would not call that until at least 2:30 at this time.
19	We will be back as I say at this point
20	within 15 or 20 minutes. Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, at 1:26 p.m. off the record
22	until 2:31 p.m.)
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Let's
24	resume the morning session.
25	Mr. Moy, if you wouldn't mind calling the

next case for our consideration. 1 2 SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir, the next case is -- is a certification of -- of the Revised Campus Plan 3 4 adopted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment 5 Application Number 16566-F, as in foxtrot, of President and Directors of Georgetown College. 6 7 was pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for a special exception for the review and approval of the University Campus 8 Plan years 2000-2010 under Section 210 in the R-3 and 9 C-1 Districts at premises bounded by Glover Archbold 10 Parkway to the west, the National Park Service 11 12 property along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and Canal Road to the south, 35th Street, N Street to 36th 13 14 Street and 36th Street to P Street to the east and 15 Reservoir Road to the north. On April 5th, 2005, the Board approved the 16 The Board approved the 17 issuance of a new order. applicant's campus plan subject to conditions. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Moy, I'm going 20 to interrupt you. 21 SECRETARY MOY: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: As -- as it's 2:30, 23 we're already running late. Not that you have moved

us to be late, but this a long reading and an opening

of this and frankly, the Board has very expeditious

24

directions and that will be for the next two cases. 1 2 In looking at the case that Mr. Moy was 3 halfway through calling on the Georgetown case, of 4 course, the Board's responsibility at this juncture 5 was to review the -- the revised submitted campus plan that was reflective of that deliberation direction 6 7 from the Board. 8 There was the community's response to 9 elements that were not -- that -- or asserted to have 10 not been included in that and we just want to bring exact clarification and quick clarification to that. 11 12 As we -- the Board in its executive session has decided to do the following. We're going 13 14 to request -- request that the university submit their 15 response to the community's concerns. There was 16 indication in the record that that was already 17 prepared. However, the process was not made available 18 in our proceedings. We are now making that process 19 available. 20 That submission would be required into the 21 Office of Zoning by this Thursday and we'll go through 22 the dates. 23 would then give a very limited 24 opportunity for the community to respond directly to

those elements that the university brings forth in

1	that submission and that is it. That's the entire
2	opening of this record.
3	We will then hear this rather decide
4	this on the 27th of September.
5	This will continue the the life of this
6	for two more weeks.
7	Mr. Moy, is that is that clear?
8	SECRETARY MOY: Yes, sir. Do you want me
9	to repeat that again?
LO	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: First, let me ask if
L1	any Board Members had any comments or if I've
L2	adequately reflected? If there are no other comments,
L3	then yes, why don't we do that and run through the
L4	schedule.
L5	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. Then the working
L6	backwards, then the special public meeting would be
L7	scheduled for September Tuesday, September 27th in
L8	the morning at 9:00, sir. Special public meeting.
L9	The applicant's submission would be due
20	this Thursday, September the 15th and responses from
21	the neighborhood would be due Thursday, September
22	22nd.
23	Is that doable?
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just for
25	clarification Mr Mov I think we quant to set it for

1	special public meeting at 9:30 on the 27th just to
2	insure that we get our executive session in and we can
3	start the day at that point.
4	Okay. Anything else on that then?
5	Comments? Questions? Very well.
6	Obviously, if there's procedural questions
7	or clarifications that are required, certainly, the
8	Office of Zoning Staff can accommodate that.
9	Let's move to the next and the last case
10	in the morning before us for a decision. That is case
11	number 17411.
12	Mr. Moy, I'm going to ask also that you
13	just announce the the title of the case and I'll
14	take it from there.
15	SECRETARY MOY: Okay. This is the motion
16	to dismiss the appeal of the appeal number of 17411
17	of Paul Basken and Josh Meyer.
18	I can just leave it at that, Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Let's do
20	so. We do obviously have a motion to dismiss in this
21	case and we had set this for a decision making on the
22	motion only and that was in order to expedite our own
23	schedule. This the the appeal case is set for
24	months in the future.
25	However, today, it appears that the

174 1 majority of the Board is not prepared to go forward 2 with a decision on the merits of the motion to dismiss 3 and so, we are going to do the following. 4 We are going to call this for hearing. 5 This will be a limited hearing on the motion only and that will be set for the third case on the 20th of 6 7 September and that is next week if I'm not mistaken. 8 Is it? Yes. The third case. We have one case on the schedule that has 9 been withdrawn and so, the time opportunity is there 10 11 for it. We will ask that -- all the participants of 12 which have been contacted already for submissions in response to this motion, we will be re-contacting them 13 14 and this will be the formal announcement to indicate that that will be called. 15 The allotment of ten minutes will be 16 17 provided to every participant and what we are going to do is set up a panel. Each participant will be at the 18

The allotment of ten minutes will be provided to every participant and what we are going to do is set up a panel. Each participant will be at the -- the interveners, the appellees, the appellants are going to sit at the table. We are going to walk down this panel with ten minutes.

After that, we will take Board's questions and then we'll dismiss and I believe we will be able -- I fully anticipate that we'll be able to take action on the 20th after hearing that.

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm going to open the floor to the Board Members at this point to ask a couple of clarifying questions to make sure that all participants address these specific issues.

And the first will come from me and that is there -- we will need a copy of their certificate of occupancy put into the record or clarification of whether that has actually be issued or the date of which it was issued.

Others.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Having read the pleadings in -- in this case with respect to the motion to dismiss, I have certain questions and I just think that I might as well throw them out at this time and perhaps the parties can focus some of their presentation on that.

One is what -- what is the triggering event in this case? Is it the building permit or the certificate of occupancy? If the building permit, why? If the certificate of occupancy, why? If it was the building permit, are there exceptional circumstances that hinder the filing of the appeal and if so, identify those.

There's a factual issue that was raised by the appellant that the intervener's attorney told the

1 appellant that the appeal date was a certain date. I 2 believe August 10th and I would like a response to that if possible. 3 4 This may go to DCRA who I hope will 5 appear, but what does conditioned upon zoning approval mean on a -- on a -- on DCRA permits and/or other 6 7 papers? I think that's it for my general questions 8 9 that came to me upon reading the pleadings. 10 Thanks. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else? Any 11 other questions? 12 I think it would be clear -- I don't --13 14 not sure we'll have another time to 15 direction, but perhaps we will. But, be that as it may, I think it should be well understood by those 16 17 that will participate in this very expeditious tenminute address to the Board that we are not going into 18 the substantive merits of the case outside of that 19 20 which is pertinent to deciding the timeliness. 21 should be very well cautioned that the utilization of 22 that time will go directly to the heart of those 23 issues. I'm a little bit concerned with some of 24

the questions that Ms. Miller brought up, but I think

1 they should be taken into context. The utilization of 2 somebody's ten minutes answering back and forth about 3 he said and told me to do whatever I did will be non-4 productive. But, that's up to those participants and 5 how they use their time. Certainly -- well, there it is. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I have one more and that is to identify exactly what the error is 8 that's complained of without getting into the merits 9 10 of the appeal. It's probably --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. I think 11 12 that's somewhat redundant to your first issue. think it has to be very clear and obviously, by posing 13 14 the question it isn't clear to the Board is -- what's 15 actually being appealed. We have to know to know 16 what's being appealed if we're going 17 timeliness. Well, you know, when does the clock start Based on what issue? 18 and stop? 19 that should be able Again, 20 accomplished without getting into the incredible substance of -- of the appeal itself. 21 22 As I say, depending on the outcome of that 23 limited hearing for the preliminary matter in this 24 case, we may well move into a full appeal

obviously, that will be the substance of which -- or

1	the time at which the substance will be heard.
2	Okay. Anything else?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to
4	make one other comment. I think that we have written
5	pleadings from the appellant, the intervener and the
6	ANC, but not from DCRA, the appellee. So, that
7	that they certainly could file one before that date if
8	they choose to. Correct? I think it might be useful
9	if they if they did that.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, but let's be
12	clear because
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: the the record
15	was open for responses to the motion.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Um-hum.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, the record is
18	still open for those that did not respond to the
19	motion.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, if that DCRA
22	response came in, I I don't think it's not my
23	anticipation that we're going to revisit, just to say
24	that we'll leave the record open for responses to all
25	the responses. We're done in terms of the

1	submissions, but the record's still open for DCRA.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Sure.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Good.
4	Anything else? Very well.
5	If there anything else, Mr. Moy, that we
6	need to address in the morning session?
7	SECRETARY MOY: No, sir, that takes care
8	of the morning session.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. If
10	there's nothing further then, let's adjourn our
11	morning session.
12	As indicated, we're going to just we
13	will call the afternoon session for the hearings at
14	3:00. Thank you all.
15	(Whereupon, the hearing was recessed at
16	2:43 p.m. to reconvene at 3:00 p.m. this same day.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

3:30 p.m.

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

2

CHAIRPERSON

3 |

GRIFFIS:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let me call to order the public hearing of the 13th of September 2005. This is, of course, the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the District of Columbia.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

I am Geoff Griffis, Chairperson.

Joining me today is the Vice Chair, Ms.

Miller and Mr. Etherly. Representing the National
Capital Planning Commission with us is Mr. Mann.

And we will not as I am aware of have a Zoning Commission member with us this afternoon.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available for you. They are located on the table where you entered into the hearing room. You can pick it up and see what we will get to with the rest of the afternoon.

I do apologize for us starting late. We had a very busy schedule in the morning. Sometimes our decision makings pile up and we're not -- can't always anticipate how long it will take for deliberation and as we see, it took quite some time.

There are a couple of very important

elements that I will go through in the opening and I 1 2 will get right to them. First of all, I'd ask that everyone turn 3 4 off their cell phones and beepers at this time so we 5 don't have a disruption of the hearings and those people giving testimony. 6 7 Normally, we would be upstairs. 8 you would be aware of that. Many of you are not. Our 9 Office of Zoning and hearing room is being renovated 10 and will be hopefully ready within the next two weeks. So, if you are to be before us next week, you should 11 check the schedule on where we will exactly be. 12 Once finished, the room will be well 13 14 accommodated for good public participation in the 15 zoning process. 16 Attendant to where we are today also, I 17 ask that, of course, anything that you've brought in with you that you take out and I say this according to 18 19 the Board. That means trash. 20 But, other than that, normally we are 21 broadcast live on our website. We are not able to do 22 that in this hearing room. 23 However, we do have the court report who 24 is creating an official transcript and -- and they are

sitting to my right on the floor.

1 Attendant to that, we ask that you fill 2 out two witness cards prior to coming forward to speak Those witness cards do go to the 3 to the Board. 4 recorder. That is obvious so you can be given credit 5 for the important things you will say into the record. procedure 6 The order of for special 7 exceptions and variances as follows, first, we start with the applicant and their case presentation of the 8 9 case. 10 Second, we will go to any government reports attendant to the application. 11 12 Third, we'll hear from the Advisory Neighborhood Commission. 13 14 Fourth, we'll hear from persons or parties 15 in support of an application. And fifth, we'll hear persons or parties 16 17 in opposition to a application. Sixth, finally, we will return to the 18 rebuttal 19 applicant for any closing remarks or 20 testimony that they may need to provide. 21 examination of witnesses is Cross 22 permitted by parties in a case. It's important to 23 understand that responsibility the οf 24 examination is for parties as established in the case. 25 The ANC within which the property is located

automatically a -- a party in the case and will, therefore, obviously then be allowed to cross examine.

Nothing precludes this Board from limiting the direction or time of cross examination. I don't often have to intervene in cross examination, but it's important to understand that you want to be direct and definitive in your questions and you will have your opportunity to provide testimony and case presentation and not all that needs to happen during the cross examination.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of each hearing on the case. It's also important to understand that this Board will be deliberating on the record that's created before us today. That meaning all the submissions that were put into the record and the testimony and any other additional information that's provided today.

At the end of the hearing unless the Board keeps the record open for very specific information, we are very specific on what is to be submitted into the record if it's left open, if we do not specify those, the record would be closed and therefore, no other information is accepted. Meaning no other information would be part of our decision.

The Sunshine Act requires that this Board

1 conduct its hearings in the open and before the 2 public. This Board does enter into executive session. We do that either before or during a hearing on a 3 4 case. This is for reviewing the record or 5 deliberating on a case and it is in accordance with procedures 6 our rules, regulations, and 7 importantly is in accordance with the Sunshine Act. We will make every effort to conclude our 8 9 afternoon session at a reasonable time tonight. Hopefully by 6:00. I'll update obviously people as we 10 get rolling very quickly into the schedule and were we 11 12 are and how much further we will need to go and, of course, if there are scheduling difficulties, as your 13 14 case is proceeding, you can bring that to 15 attention. That being said, let us go to a good very 16 good afternoon to Ms. Bailey on the right representing 17 the Office of Zoning and also the Office of Attorney 18 19 General , Ms. Glazer is with us. 20 Let us ask, Ms. Bailey, if you are aware 21 of any -- actually, in fact, let me ask if everyone 22 is prepared to testify or thinking 23 testifying if you would please stand and give your 24 attention to Ms. Bailey, she's going to swear you in.

MS. BAILEY: Please raise your right hand.

1 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you 2 will be giving today will be the truth, the whole 3 truth, and nothing but the truth? 4 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Now, we 5 can appropriately go to whether there preliminary matters for the Board's attention in this 6 afternoon's cases. 7 8 Ms. Bailey, when you're ready. If you are 9 aware of any preliminary matters, Ms. Bailey will If you have a preliminary matter --10 indicate those. here have a preliminary matter, preliminary matters 11 12 are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today, requests for postponements, 13 14 continuances, withdrawals, whether proper and adequate 15 notice has been provided of an application. These are elements of preliminary matters that the Board might 16 want to take up prior to calling the case. 17 If you have a preliminary matter or think 18 19 you do, you can have a seat at the table in front of 20 us as an indication and I will ask, Ms. Bailey, if 21 you're aware of any that the Board should view. 22 MS. BAILEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it has to 23 do with application number 1731 -- I thought I had it. 24 Should I say good afternoon as well. 25 17274, Mario Alas and Haydee Varegas,

1 there is a request for a continuance of the hearing on 2 this case. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Is the 4 applicant present? Is anyone involved in this case 5 present? correct 6 Ms. Bailey, am I in mу 7 understanding that Exhibit Number 24 is the only submission to date -- for today's hearing? 8 9 Yes, Mr. Chairman. MS. BAILEY: 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. Board Members, I'll draw your attention to Exhibit Number 24 11 that reads Dear Mr. Jerrily Kress. "I need to 12 postpone the hearing date Tuesday, September 13th, 13 14 2005. Please reschedule." 15 I only bring this to our attention because there's a basis of which we will entertain preliminary 16 matters for continuances. 17 This is not the first requested by this applicant. I don't see any reason 18 19 to persuade me to grant a postponement and reschedule 20 this and so, I'm somewhat at a loss of what we might 21 do and with the applicant not even present today to 22 address it, perhaps I'm at even more of a loss, but 23 I'll open it up for others for their comment or 24 understanding. 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: My understanding

1 is that this is the third request for a postponement 2 and given that, I think that it should be supported That, you know, by the time we get 3 with good reason. 4 to the third one, it's less compelling to -- to grant. 5 I don't think -- and I don't think there is a good reason to grant this. 6 7 I think our history has been, you know, 8 often maybe two postponements and by the third time, 9 it's like three strikes you're out unless you at least 10 give us a good reason and -- and that's not present here. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Okay. As -and you are correct, we -- we have set this for three 13 14 hearings, January, March and September. 15 Any other comments? Others. 16 We take this obviously as a motion to 17 postpone or continue before us and without adequate and substantive reasoning why, we would do that, I 18 19 would have to move denial of the motion to continue 20 and ask for a second. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Second. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. All of 23 if there other further you are are any 24 deliberations if there's any requirement for.

noting any other comments, we do have a motion before

1	us. It's been seconded. Ask for all those in favor
2	signify by saying aye.
3	(Ayes.)
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed? Why
5	don't we record the vote then?
6	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the vote is
7	recorded as 4-0-1 to deny the the motion to
8	postpone the hearing. Mr. Griffis made the motion.
9	Ms. Miller second. Mr. Mann and Mr. Etherly are in
10	agreement.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Let's
12	move ahead then.
13	MS. BAILEY: Staff has no other
14	preliminary matters, Mr. Chairman.
15	MEMBER ETHERLY: Pardon the interruption,
16	Mr. Chair. Just inquiring as we just denied the
17	motion for a postponement on the prior case, my my
18	question was whether or not that then presages some
19	additional action that we have to take with that case
20	to dispose of it or or otherwise hold it in
21	abeyance.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I think that's very
23	logical. I think we do need a second step on this.
24	I think we'd have to I think we have to hear a
25	motion from the Board to dismiss.

	109
1	MEMBER ETHERLY: And I would
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Ms. Glazer, do you
3	agree?
4	MS. GLAZER: Yes, Mr. Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There it is.
6	MEMBER ETHERLY: And I would I would be
7	inclined to agree with that direction, Mr. Chair.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So moved. Seconded?
9	MEMBER ETHERLY: Seconded.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Very
11	well. Any other deliberation, comments on it?
12	We have a motion to dismiss the
13	application. I'll ask for all in favor signify by
14	saying aye.
15	(Ayes.)
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Opposed? Excellent.
17	Let's move on then. Yes.
18	MS. FERSTER: Andrea Ferster.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you guys are so
20	far away up here. Needs to be a little closer.
21	MS. FERSTER: Andrea Ferster, Council for
22	Friends and Neighbors of Square 3191, case number
23	17349. We have filed a motion to dismiss that
24	application.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: This was okay.

1	Good. Who else is here?
2	MS. GIORDANO: I'm sorry. Cynthia
3	Giordano and we have a preliminary matter for case
4	17355.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. What's your
6	preliminary matter?
7	MS. GIORDANO: A motion to dismiss or
8	postpone it was filed with the Commission last I
9	mean the Board last Thursday. Maybe you don't have it
10	in front of you.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: This is like
12	motion's practice day. Motions
13	MS. GIORDANO: I have a copy.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, we have it. I
15	I don't mean to be
16	MS. GIORDANO: Oh.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: too comical. We
18	we've seen them all.
19	Ms. Ferster, it's when was yours
20	submitted? The 13th?
21	MS. FERSTER: Our our motion was filed
22	on September 13th.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That would be today.
24	MS. FERSTER: Oh, no, I'm sorry. It was
25	filed on Friday.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Stamped in on
2	the 13th then. It probably didn't make it in the
3	file.
4	MS. FERSTER: Friday at 3:20. I guess it
5	was no, I I I filed it Friday morning. I
6	and I have a stamp that shows it in the morning. Let
7	me get my stamp.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I think it's
9	going to be most expeditious if we if we call the
10	cases. We'll take up the preliminary matter. The
11	the 17355 is the first case to go and then we'll
12	take up the second preliminary matter at the calling
13	of the case as they're both motions that are very
14	substantive. It will take some time to get into that.
15	Agreed?
16	MS. GIORDANO: Okay. The only reason I
17	brought it up was because I thought you were moving
18	on.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. No. No.
20	It's absolutely appropriate to do so and sorry if I've
21	befuddled things.
22	So, we'll we'll call your case and then
23	we'll take up the motion at that time.
24	In which case, let's move right into
25	calling the the second case of the afternoon

1	session.
2	MS. BAILEY: Are we on the Stettinius'
3	case, Mr okay. Application number 17355 of Joseph
4	Stettinius, excuse the pronunciation, pursuant to 11
5	DCMR 3104.1 for a special exception to allow side
6	additions to an existing single-family dwelling under
7	Section 223 not meeting the side yard requirements.
8	That's Section 405. The property is zoned R-1-B and
9	it's located at 3051 Avon Lane, N.W., Square 1282, Lot
10	258.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Thank you.
12	Very well. Ms. Giordano, you have a preliminary
13	motion to dismiss and you're representing the
14	applicant. Is that correct?
15	MR. HORSEY: Yes, I do. Outerbridge
16	Horsey, architect representing Regina and Joseph
17	Stettinius.
18	I have a response to that motion, Mr.
19	Chairman.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Let me
21	just clarify first of all the motion so that we're all
22	on the same focus here.
23	The the the issue is that you want
24	the applicant to come in compliance with the building

code requirements prior to coming to the Board for

1	this application.
2	MS. GIORDANO: Correct. The actually,
3	it's a matter of statute as well that a building
4	permit is required before a property owner proceeds to
5	erect certain kinds of structures which these are
6	covered. It's it's a matter of statute and
7	building code.
8	And the idea being that, you know, the
9	these structures aren't even on. They haven't had any
LO	zoning review or any zoning computations done and it
L1	seems to me out of order to go ahead and consider some
L2	additional structures on the property when the Zoning
L3	Administrator hasn't even signed off on these
L4	structures that were constructed recently without
L5	permits and they include a pool house, the a roof
L6	over a deck making it a porch.
L7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed.
L8	MS. GIORDANO: And a trellis and some gate
L9	gate structures.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed.
21	MS. GIORDANO: The pool house obviously
22	being the most substantive.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Okay. And
24	I've gotten way ahead of myself. Because, Ms.

Giordano, we need to take up your request for party

1	status first and then we'll get into the motion. Of
2	course, we're going to address all of that.
3	Board Members, first of all, do you have
4	preliminary questions on the request for party status
5	of the filing, Exhibit Number 22, that you can re-
6	review for that.
7	Not learning any
8	MEMBER ETHERLY: No objection.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
10	Mr. Horsey, do you have the application
11	for party status? Do you have a copy of it?
12	MR. HORSEY: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have any
14	comments of it? Do you have a position?
15	MR. HORSEY: We we have no opposition.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No opposition.
17	MR. HORSEY: Other than I think their
18	claim to party status well, we'd like to oppose it,
19	but their claim is pretty clear.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
21	MR. HORSEY: I think they have the right
22	to be a party.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. I don't
24	have any difficulty either. I think that they meet
25	the special test for being granted party status.
l	

1 Unless there's any objection be taken, it's the 2 consensus of the Board to move ahead into the -- the motion to be taken up. 3 4 Let me find some clarity, Ms. Giordano. 5 Are you indicating that some of the aspects that have not been reviewed properly or as you're asserting that 6 7 don't comply with the D.C. building construction laws are not part of this application, but they need to be 8 remedied first before an application comes? 9 Yes, within the last few 10 MS. GIORDANO: years, these structures were built on the subject 11 12 property without permits and I'm just suggesting that that situation should be corrected. Permits should be 13 14 obtained for those, proper reviews done before the 15 Board considered exception an the zoning to regulations for that property. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 17 I see. 18 MS. GIORDANO: And I quess this letter 19 indicates that the Old Georgetown Board 20 preliminarily approved them, but the Georgetown Board 21 doesn't permit structures in the District of Columbia. 22 They just do a concept review for the design and it's 23 really not relevant and the question is whether a

building permit application has been filed and a

permit has been issued.

24

1	And the Board, you know, I I'm sure
2	you're well aware that, you know, the situation with
3	the the zoning inspection office at present and I
4	understand from the Fine Arts Commission staff that
5	they when they became aware that these structures
6	hadn't been permitted, referred them to the inspection
7	and never got any follow-up, but I'm suggesting that
8	the Board as one part of this process should also see
9	to it that the the construction and the D.C. laws
10	are followed and that property owners get permits
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Absolutely.
12	MS. GIORDANO: for structures that
13	require them.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't think we
15	have any disagreement that the law should be followed.
16	However, what I need to get right into
17	then is where we have actually the jurisdiction under
18	our procedure to preclude an applicant from coming
19	forward if there's an allegation of of non-
20	permitted construction prior.
21	Because quite frankly, then every what
22	I need you to do is point in the regulations of where
23	that requirement is made to grant an application.
24	Because that it should be then threshold for
25	everyone that walks in the door to say look, we are in

1 total compliance with all building codes, regulations. 2 These are our whole history of permits. Our elevators Our windows work. You know, we -- and 3 are working. 4 I'm not aware that we do that. 5 MS. GIORDANO: Right. I -- I don't think 6 you're going to find it in your regulations, but 7 certainly as a matter of case law, unclean hands is a well-established doctrine for seeking discretionary 8 9 relief before a zoning body. 10 And here, you know, a postponement may be more appropriate. The idea being that, you know, 11 bring the property into zoning compliance first before 12 you consider the exception. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Indeed. Any 15 initial questions from the Board? 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well -- well, 17 I mean one is it sounds like you're suggesting as -- as good public policy that we should postpone 18 19 because these other permits haven't been gotten yet 20 and then you mentioned case law regarding unclean 21 hands. Are you referring to just case law in general 22 about unclean hands or is there some specific --23 MS. GIORDANO: In the zoning context. 24 can certainly provide something and I didn't bring it

with me, but probably the Office of Attorney General

could comment on the fact that unclean hands is -- can be a factor in zoning cases. The courts have acknowledged that.

And as a matter of the specific interests of this adjacent property owner, many times the Board has postponed hearings on the request of an adjacent property owner in order to clarify a record that's what we're interested in here, as well that the property is in compliance with zoning now and the zoning computations are based upon computations that can be discernible in the public record.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That was my second question. Is your request for postponement based on not having computations that are necessary to evaluate this case?

MS. GIORDANO: It's both and in this case, we can't go to the Zoning Office to look up the zoning computations for the property and find out, you know, whether these additional structures are going to tip the balance or not in terms of the lot occupancy or other zoning computations and pool houses in particular have been structures in this -- in the city where there have been issues about whether they exceed the requirements for accessory structures.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions?

1 MR. HORSEY: Mr. Chairman, may I comment 2 at some point? 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. Absolutely, 4 you will, but let me just finish questioning Ms. 5 Giordano. Any -- any further? Okay. And -- and one important one that was just 6 7 brought up was the -- the computations and Mr. Horsey 8 is now going to address that as he's done in the 9 written submission that's just been handed to the Board and I hope Ms. Giordano has a copy of it. 10 It states that he's certifying, in fact, 11 12 that the full house, rear porch and trellis have been included in the zoning computations submitted 26 13 14 April. 15 I'll let you follow up, Mr. Horsey, you have additional address to that notion. 16 MR. HORSEY: Right. I just wanted to make 17 sure that point was clear. That they are included in 18 19 the 36 percent lot occupancy calculation that we 20 performed and -- and in terms of the -- in terms of 21 the approval, this issue has been matter of public 22 record for over -- over two months. 23 Had we been -- you know, had -- had there 24 been a clear-cut policy that we should have proceeded 25 to get these permits before, we certainly could have.

They're -- they're minor structures. The Office of Planning in their report on page -- has a picture of two of the -- of the -- page three has a picture of the pool house and the trellis and you can see that they're very minor structures.

What we discussed with the Old Georgetown Board and the D.C. Historic Preservation Board and -- and I would take issue with Ms. Giordano's comment about the Old Georgetown Board not being, and I think they would too, part of the regulatory process and certainly, the Historic Preservation Division who participates in their meetings has -- that we agreed that we would submit the final drawings for a permit with the drawings for whatever addition project either comes out of this meeting or as a result of this meeting, one way or the other.

So, that's what we agreed. I mean we can -- the permit drawings are easy to do. They're -- they're -- so, I see no reason why -- we're all here now. Everybody's down here ready to -- ready to testify as to the merits of our specific case. There's nothing in these accessory structures that has anything to do with our special application -- special exception application. I don't think we should be penalized.

1	When I found out about it, when the
2	Stettinius were were fully aware of what what
3	was what the situation was, we took measures to
4	address and I don't think we should be penalized for
5	that. I think
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Follow-up questions.
7	Mr. Mann.
8	MEMBER MANN: Which of the structures had
9	to be included in the computation of the lot
10	occupancy?
11	MR. HORSEY: The the pool house, the
12	trellis and the the rear porch. Which,
13	incidentally, contrary to Ms. Giordano's statement,
14	did not replace a deck. It replaced a fixed awning
15	not a retractable awning that I have a photograph of.
16	The gate does not exceed the four-foot
17	high height limit. So, it's not included in lot
18	coverage.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions,
20	clarifications? Anything else? There it is.
21	Deliberation. Comments.
22	MEMBER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair, I I
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
24	MEMBER ETHERLY: I'm I'm just not
25	convinced. The initial reaction is that I would have

to guess, perhaps an educated one, that -- that there are other channels through which these concerns can be 3 addressed whether it's enforcement through DCRA. 4 Would be kind of the first -- the first thought that would come to mind rather than this being the 6 appropriate venue for -- for -- for prosecuting concerns as relates to -- to those permitting issues. So, it would be my inclination based on 8 9 that ground alone, Mr. Chair, to -- to deny the motion. That's -- that's kind of my initial reaction. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Yes, I 12 don't see -- I don't see this issue rises to the level of just missing the application. So, I would concur 13 14 with your thoughts in that. 15 MEMBER ETHERLY: And -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Just because you did -- you did reference and reminded me that the -- the motion did, of course, note either an outright dismissal or postponement and 18 I would agree with you that -- that -- that ground as it's been argued to this point would not satisfy -would not constitute grounds for dismissal 22 postponement in my opinion. 23 Thank you. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. And -- and I would go further -- well, I would agree with that and

1

2

5

7

10

11

16

17

19

20

21

would add that the -- also just postponing the hearing, it seems to me that we're here for a special exception. I would look at the impacts under 223 of what is being proposed. Of course, it's what's being proposed under the existing condition.

Where we would factor in whether it was permitted correctly, built correctly, constructibility and such, I think goes beyond our -- our jurisdiction. I think that we would not say that we -- we wouldn't want proper permitting and documentation to have happened, but I'm not sure how we step back and preclude an application from going forward in order to remedy that situation and I have more assurance of the fact that this has been brought to light and public light at this point, now, it's on the record, that it will be, in fact, remedied.

Now, the -- the -- the reality of the remedy may well be it has to be removed. It's just not so certain that perhaps it may not get permitted. I'm not projecting or forecasting anything.

But, what we have before us right now I think is a -- is a -- a straightforward enough application that we should proceed with and, therefore, I would move that we deny the motion to dismiss and postpone at this time and ask for second.

1	MEMBER ETHERLY: Seconded, Mr. Chair.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you, Mr.
3	Etherly. Comments.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I I just
5	would like to further address the question of the
6	computations which I think is a second issue.
7	I I am not convinced by what I heard
8	that there are computations outstanding that would
9	necessitate postponing this case. We have in the
LO	opposition that was filed the architect certifying the
l1	computations that are relevant to this case.
L2	So, it seems like the information is here
L3	and that there's no reason to postpone.
L4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, and
L5	importantly, the representative of the applicant is
L6	here to be cross examined or questioned in the case.
L7	We have established the party in this case and that's
L8	then others, comments?
L9	I think it's appropriate to move quickly
20	ahead then to get into the substance of this case.
21	We do have a motion before us. It has
22	been seconded. Let me ask for all those in favor
23	signify by saying aye.
24	(Ayes.)
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Opposed? Excellent.

1	Ms. Giordano, we'll look forward to
2	hearing your case.
3	Let's move ahead.
4	MS. GIORDANO: All right. I'd like to
5	call our witnesses to the table please.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why don't we hear
7	the applicant's first.
8	MS. GIORDANO: Oh, I'm sorry.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Then we'll yes,
10	that's okay. I know we're trying to move things along
11	here.
12	MS. GIORDANO: I'm use
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Unless we want to do
14	it all at the same time. Then when you're ready,
15	Mr. Horsey.
16	MR. HORSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
17	want to do this as quickly as I can without first
18	of all, this is the site plan.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm sorry.
20	MR. HORSEY: I'm sorry.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why don't you move
22	one of the just one mike closer to the
23	MR. HORSEY: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, and I'm sorry.
25	But, we do have a party here that is going to present

1 their case. I'm going to ask you to move over on this 2 side so that you can see this. We can pull those 3 boards out just a little bit and please feel free to 4 move around to make sure that you're seeing everything 5 that -- that -- that we are. And is this -- these photographs that 6 7 you're showing now have been submitted into the record 8 or no? 9 MR. HORSEY: Yes. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. MR. HORSEY: The -- the drawings I'm 11 12 showing you deviate from what we originally submitted in a very minor way and I'll -- I'll point out those 13 14 changes that were done at the request of the Old 15 Georgetown Board. These site is located at 3051 Avon Lane. 16 17 Avon Lane goes from Avon Place south of R Street to It was originally built off of Avon 18 31st Street. 19 Place and the structures -- these two structures were 20 built at the same time in 1948. Adjacent is a large 21 tennis court and three accessory buildings. 22 Our project includes a -- an attached 23 existing one-story garage and a three-story dwelling. 24 You can see them here. Here's the -- the dwelling

here and the garage on Avon Place. This garage and

1 then over here, you see the space between the back of 2 the garage and the house. Here's the rear of the 3 house with the porch structure. Another view is the 4 view of the garage and the gate. Here's a view of the 5 garage and the second story or the attic story on the house behind and here is a view of the house from the 6 7 tennis court of the adjoining property Our project proposes three additions. 8 9 one-story addition here. Right in here replacing this bay window. A two-story addition wrapping around the 10 main house, abutting up against the tennis court and 11 the second one-story addition at the rear of the 12 13 structure. 14 These isometric drawings probably 15 illustrate it most clearly. This is the view from the southeast 16 17 showing the existing house, the garage, the three accessory structures, the tennis court and here are 18 19 additions here. The one-story addition in the garden. 20 The two-story addition wrapping around and the one-21 story addition in the back. It's behind there. 22 Here you see the existing house with the 23 side yard, the attached garage in the front. 24 Here's our one-story addition in the rear. 25 Two-story addition wrapping around. You can just see

1 the top of the one-story addition in the southeast 2 corner. Here is the tennis court next door along with 3 the three accessory buildings. 4 Existing first-floor plan. Proposed 5 first-floor plan. We propose to enclose this onestory addition here along the property line as a 6 7 library and enclosing the rest of the side yard to 8 enlarge a very small kitchen here and connect it 9 directly to the -- to the garage and then the third addition here is this garden room in the southeast 10 corner replacing the bay window. 11 The second floor, the only addition here 12 is the master bedroom which again connects to the 13 14 garage and goes to the side lot line. 15 This is the elevation from Avon Lane 16 existing here. Proposed here is our one-story garden room structure in the corner and two-story master 17 18 bedroom behind the garage. 19 This is the rear. We're also proposing a 20 small chimney and fireplace and here's the one-story addition at the rear and the side yard here and the 21 22 two-story addition beyond. Finally, the front, this is actually the 23 24 front of the house which you access off of Avon Lane. 25 Come down past our one-story addition. You go in the

front door of that one-story addition with a two-story addition behind. Here's the existing porch and new chimney in the back and this is the view from the neighbor's tennis courts. This is the existing structure and proposed.

One of the issues that -- that will be up for discussion amongst others is the amount of windows in this and you'll note that the actual amount as they affect the privacy of the tennis court and you'll note that -- that the actual window -- number of windows that face the property -- the neighboring property now gets reduced by about a third.

Finally, I'd like to talk about the -- I'd like to go a little bit through the criteria, let me put these back up here, for the special exception.

The criteria are very specific with regard to our application and as -- as the Office of Planning calls out in their very thorough report, it really affects substantial impact on the neighboring property.

The adjacent house -- this shows the neighboring tennis court with the three accessory structures, one story, one and a half story and two story structure. This is our property here. You notice about the same -- a good deal of our property

1 doglegs down to Avon Place, about 23 percent of the 2 property which provides a fair about of open space and 3 basically un-buildable by -- by my clients, 4 certainly is open space for the neighborhood. The -- the criteria is that an addition 5 shall not have a substantial adverse impact on the use 6 7 or enjoyment of abutting dwelling or property. In particular, the light and air available to neighboring 8 properties shall not be unduly affected. 9 The -- the house, the actual single-family 10 house on this property is about 110 feet away. Across 11 12 the tennis court, you see the very end of it. These two illustrations are taken from the Office of 13 14 Planning report and enlarged. You can also see the structure, the single-family house, here and here's 15 our site there. So, it's about 120 feet away. 16 So, the impact on that house itself is --17 is negligible if -- if -- if existent and it's hard to 18 19 construe that the impact on a -- on a -- on a 7200 20 square foot tennis court where four people play by a 21 one-story addition 20 feet long and a two-story 22 addition 27 feet long really qualifies as --23 substantial impact. 24 Another criteria is the privacy, use and

enjoyment of neighboring properties cannot be unduly

1 compromise and again, I think the same argument can be This is a very large property. 2 We have a made. 3 tennis court nearby and the additions that we're 4 making are more or less the size of the additions --5 of the -- already on that property on the south side of the tennis court. 6 7 The third criteria is the addition together with the original building as viewed from the 8 9 street, alley and other public way shall 10 substantially protrude upon the character, scale and pattern of houses along the subject street frontage. 11 comply with that and satisfy 12 think we requirement as well. We've been before the Old 13 14 Georgetown Board twice and gotten approval both times. 15 Oh, I should go back and tell you what's In the drawings, the Old Georgetown Board 16 asked us to refine this structure. Basically is the 17 only change to this from the drawings that you have. 18 19 This has gotten a little bit more developed. 20 the cupolas. We got cupolas as well. 21 Finally, I'd like to just go through the 22 process a little bit. The -- we started this process 23 in mid-April. Went to the ANC. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just turn the mike.

MR. HORSEY: Oh, I'm sorry. We submitted

1 to the ANC and to the Old Georgetown Board. The 2 Stettinius contacted their neighbor and solicited their opinions and eventually won the support of all 3 4 the abutting neighbors including the neighbors that 5 are here today in opposition. And, in fact, at the request -- specific 6 7 request of the neighbors, the Friendlys who are here today in opposition, my clients postponed our initial 8 9 ANC meeting to give them more time and which is 10 worthwhile eventually because they came to agreement and said that they would support the project and even 11 12 encouraged us to put more windows on the tennis court to relieve the unbroken brickwork. 13 14 We've been to the ANC twice. Three times, 15 in fact and gotten their approval all three times. 16 So, finally, that -- that concludes my 17 opening remarks. I'd like the opportunity to come 18 back and address that thev any comments have 19 afterwards. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank 21 Ouestions from the Board? you much. 22 Clarifications? Ms. Miller. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Could you just 24 clarify how many windows are going to be on the side

abutting the tennis court?

1	MR. HORSEY: Right now, the ANC and their
2	motion on the on the special exception gave us
3	unanimous approval contingent upon the rule on these
4	windows. We would like to keep this window here in
5	the kitchen. Even if the wall ends up being covered
6	by ivy as we expect it will, just to get some sense of
7	daylight. This is the property line window.
8	This window here which is in the staircase
9	and again doesn't really admit much view, we're
10	willing to give up if the Board deems that necessary.
11	And what was here before, you can see the
12	window of the existing kitchen, two windows from the
13	bedroom upstairs and a window from the interior of the
14	house. This window
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: where the
16	kitchen is?
17	MR. HORSEY: There would be one window now
18	like this.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
20	you.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm trying to
22	reconcile the comment you made and I think it's also
23	in your written submission about the addition reduces
24	a third the number of windows. Is that what you said?
25	MR. HORSEY: Yes. Well

of windows here. So, we're about 40 foot here. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, I see. So, it's not the number, but rather the square footage. MR. HORSEY: Right. Right. Square footage. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes. MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're notyou're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side. The neighborhood's a mixed neighborhood	1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I count 11.
A CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, I see. So, it's not the number, but rather the square footage. MR. HORSEY: Right. Right. Square footage. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes. MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're notyou're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	2	MR. HORSEY: This is about 60 square feet
not the number, but rather the square footage. MR. HORSEY: Right. Right. Square footage. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes. MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're notyou're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	3	of windows here. So, we're about 40 foot here.
footage. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes. MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not	4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, I see. So, it's
footage. Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes. MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	5	not the number, but rather the square footage.
MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	6	MR. HORSEY: Right. Right. Square
MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	7	footage. Right.
relationship of the neighboring property. Is the tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes.
tennis court and those four accessory structures along with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	9	MEMBER MANN: Explain to me if you can the
with a home all on one piece of property that's next door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	10	relationship of the neighboring property. Is the
door? MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	11	tennis court and those four accessory structures along
MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	12	with a home all on one piece of property that's next
15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not 16 you're not getting picked up. You can actually take 17 that out of the that monstrous thing. 18 MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door 19 has these three accessory structures and I guess 20 there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are 21 attached. The third one's attached to our garage and 22 then the main house is here. Single-family house. 23 The there's an apartment building to 24 the north side.	13	door?
you're not getting picked up. You can actually take that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	14	MR. HORSEY: Yes. Correct.
that out of the that monstrous thing. MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, you're not
MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	16	you're not getting picked up. You can actually take
has these three accessory structures and I guess there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	17	that out of the that monstrous thing.
there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	18	MR. HORSEY: Yes, this property next door
attached. The third one's attached to our garage and then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	19	has these three accessory structures and I guess
then the main house is here. Single-family house. The there's an apartment building to the north side.	20	there's a fourth one there, a small one. These are
The there's an apartment building to the north side.	21	attached. The third one's attached to our garage and
the north side.	22	then the main house is here. Single-family house.
	23	The there's an apartment building to
The neighborhood's a mixed neighborhood		ine energy an aparement parraing co
	24	

1 with -- with row houses here. In fact, we have a --2 the zoning district boundary line actually cuts right through our property with R-3 on one side and R-1-B on 3 4 the other. 5 MEMBER MANN: So, there's an accessory structure right now that's connected to the garage on 6 7 your property. 8 MR. HORSEY: Correct. Correct. They're 9 all -- they're all three -- these are the three 10 neighboring accessory structures all connected and they share a -- a -- a common wall with our garage 11 12 which is also on the line. In fact, where that garage -- when it was -- when it was created as a lot that 13 14 fronted on Avon Place, it was in the rear yard in 15 theory before the zoning regulations were created. 16 Now, it's in the front yard which is a 17 non-conforming condition which we are removing by our project by attaching to it. 18 MEMBER MANN: And does the addition -- if 19 20 the addition were built, does that abut the property 21 line next to the tennis court? 22 MR. HORSEY: Yes, it would go right up to 23 It would eliminate -- we're -- we're requesting 24 100 percent side yard relief which would be

necessary in any case were we just simply to attach to

1 the garage here. It would eliminate the side yard and 2 create a court, but we're seeking also permission to in-fill the side yard. 3 4 MEMBER MANN: Thank you. 5 MEMBER ETHERLY: If I could, Mr. Chair, while we're -- while we're looking at the -- the 6 7 isometric that's -- that's presently up, Mr. Horsey, 8 could you -- could you speak a bit to -- I understand 9 the respond and I think it's an acceptable one 10 regarding the -- the -- the reduction essentially of windows on the side that abuts the tennis court. 11 12 MR. HORSEY: Um-hum. MEMBER ETHERLY: Could you speak 13 14 whether or not there is any change with regard to the 15 massing of the -- of the existing property versus the 16 proposed condition? Is there -- is there a change in terms of the massing or does the massing stay the same 17 relative to the tennis court? 18 19 MR. HORSEY: No, we're -- we're adding 20 more mass right up against the tennis court. There's 21 a two-story element here. Right now, there's a fence 22 which I can show you here. Where is it? And, 23 fact, it might be -- sorry. Somewhere here. 24 is.

We're adding the one-story structure here

and a two-story structure right up against the tennis court.

This is how it looks now. These two photographs were submitted to the public record at the ANC meeting by Mr. Friendly in statement of opposition at that time trying to show the difference between the ivy-covered fence that's there now and our proposed addition which would come right up to the property line.

I have two comments about that. One, that when Mr. and Mrs. Stettinius moved in, this is what the ivy-covered fence looked like. They planted the ivy to give themselves some more privacy and this other picture down here shows what the fence could look like if -- if the Friendlys planted ivy on their side after our addition was built. Basically the same.

So, the windows here are the existing windows. This is the only window that you would see in the stairwell. The other one we'd like to keep would be behind the ivy there.

MEMBER ETHERLY: So -- so, with respect to the question of -- and I'm kind of pursuing the issue of air and light here. There is a -- if you're looking at the -- the existing condition now, you are

1 essentially losing some edging at the higher -- at the 2 higher portions of the proposed addition. Correct? Correct. 3 MR. HORSEY: 4 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. Has there either 5 -- and feel free, of course, if the answer is no, has there been any assessment of what the light and air 6 7 impact is by virtue of losing this opening here and by 8 here for -- for purposes of the record, I'm indicating 9 the top most picture in the applicant's presentation. 10 These pictures haven't been submitted into the record. So, they won't have to be, but just for purposes of 11 the record, I'm --12 13 MR. HORSEY: Right. 14 MEMBER ETHERLY: -- okay. Have you taken 15 a look at that or --16 MR. HORSEY: Sure. can you offer an 17 MEMBER ETHERLY: 18 opinion the impact based on on your 19 understanding of -- of the proposal? 20 I think it goes back to the MR. HORSEY: 21 criteria and I can offer you my opinion which is that 22 it doesn't come close to qualifying as undue affect. 23 You know, to -- to say that the -- and remember, we're 24 taking this from halfway across the tennis court. 25 actual house from which these zoning regulations are

designed to protect primarily is 110 feet away.

So, the impact of -- of this area in here that we are in-filling here on the house itself 110 feet away is -- is negligible. The impact here I think it's really a matter of weighing the criteria and you have four people playing tennis on a tennis court. Sure they need light and they need the air. I -- I -- I submit that there's plenty of light and air even with our addition for those four people.

MEMBER ETHERLY: Let me ask -- ask you a question. I'll -- I'll disclose for the benefit of the record as I always that being an avid tennis player myself sometimes get curious about these things.

MR. HORSEY: Right.

MEMBER ETHERLY: But, of course, that -that has no import here and I will feel very able to
sit on this case impartially and not allow my tennis
love to come into play here. No pun intended.

But, seriously, with respect to the statement that you just made, is it -- is it your sense that as we talk about undue impact to light and air that that language specifically references light and air that would -- relative to another property as opposed to in this instance I think we will probably

1 here some testimony from the party in opposition regarding impact on the tennis court in particular? 2 3 Is it -- are -- are you contending that there is some 4 -- some slightly different standard if you will for a 5 tennis court as opposed to a structure? 6 MR. HORSEY: My -- my -- my conceptual 7 understanding of the zoning regulations is 8 they're there to promote the health, safety and 9 welfare of people living in Washington, D.C. and using their property for their own enjoyment and so, the 10 primary -- the primary purpose of the protection to --11 12 to -- is -- is basically to the dwelling. If there's an open field there, if there's a swimming pool, the 13 14 tennis court and I think it's also in consideration of 15 the entire boundary of this property. 16 You know, we are -- we had a -- a row 17 house here ten feet away and we're doing this, it would be very different from the situation that we 18 19 have which is -- I don't know how big the property is, 20 a quarter of an acre or something, three-quarters of 21 an acre I guess. How big is the property? Anyway, 22 the -- I just go back to the undue impact. That's --23 That's all I compare. that's all. 24 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you.

MR. HORSEY: Yes.

1 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, when I 3 look at the regulations, it -- it says dwelling or 4 property and without having heard the other side yet, 5 it appears that this case would be about interfering with the privacy or enjoyment of the tennis court and 6 7 I think that is something that we can consider under 8 the regulations. 9 And I guess when I look at your pictures, I mean it looks to me like well, all that's necessary 10 11 to protect that is to, you know, put up another fence 12 I guess my question is given that the with ivy. tennis court's already built, could they put that 13 14 fence up with ivy without interfering with the space that's necessary for the tennis court? 15 MR. HORSEY: Well, actually, our intention 16 is to maintain the fence that's there. To remove the 17 ivy that grows from our property which I think we 18 19 would all agree is our right and to maintain the fence 20 that we agree or we -- we are pretty sure is on their 21 property and another -- and to maintain that fence and 22 to allow them the possibility of growing ivy on their 23 fence. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, are you

saying that the same fence is going to remain?

1	MR. HORSEY: Yes, that's our intention.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, okay.
3	MR. HORSEY: Yes.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I thought that
5	it that
6	MR. HORSEY: Right.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: you were
8	building to the property line and and that was
9	going to come down.
10	MR. HORSEY: That that was the
11	original. When when we were all in in agreement
12	about this, that was the original discussion and
13	that's why it's not shown on these drawings, but now,
14	we have we it is our intention to maintain the
15	fence.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: You're going to
17	maintain the fence, but it's on their property?
18	MR. HORSEY: On their property. I mean to
19	make sure it stays there.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
21	you.
22	MEMBER MANN: Did you say that the number
23	and placement of the windows was dictated by guidance
24	from HPRB?
25	MR. HORSEY: The Old Georgetown Board

1 asked us to design some relief into this wall. 2 wanted some light in the kitchen especially in the stairwell and -- and the neighbors, the Friendlys, in 3 4 their original letter of -- of support encouraged us 5 to put windows in. So, that -- that's what the windows were about. 6 7 As I said, we're willing to -- we'd like to keep the one in the kitchen if possible. 8 9 certainly willing to give this one up in 10 We can put a skylight in or a window around the corner. 11 MEMBER MANN: So, the guidance that you --12 13 the --14 MR. HORSEY: And we'd have to go back to 15 the Old Georgetown Board. The -- the quidance that 16 MEMBER MANN: 17 you've received so far from the Old Georgetown Board did or did not dictate that a particular maximum or 18 19 minimum number of windows would be on --MR. HORSEY: It did not. It did not. 20 21 -- we have shown here recesses in the window in the 22 wall to -- to sort of break up the wall and if we 23 eliminated this, we would replace it with a similar 24 just to give the wall some detail

character.

1	MEMBER MANN: So, the number of windows is
2	actually being accomplished through some negotiation
3	process outside of the purview of an official
4	MR. HORSEY: I think I think they would
5	accept that. Yes and we'd have to go back to them
6	with whatever you know, whatever we negotiate and
7	see how they feel about it.
8	MEMBER MANN: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions
10	from the Board?
11	You indicated the the existing
12	conditions and structures have been characterized to
13	the lot occupancy and the lot occupancy has been
14	indicated as being proposed to increase to 36 percent.
15	Is that correct?
16	MR. HORSEY: yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And did you submit
18	the calculations?
19	MR. HORSEY: I submitted in the in the
20	typical form. Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just but, you
22	didn't have a site plan where they're shown to be
23	calculated?
24	MR. HORSEY: No, I'd be happy to submit
25	that.
	•

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. Okay. So, they're -- they're stated though. Okay.

MR. HORSEY: They're stated in the -- in the spreadsheet that is part of the application.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well and the existing condition at this point is 24 percent lot occupancy. It's moved to increase to 36 percent which is well under the actual allowable of 40 percent. Not invoking any of the aspects of the 223.

Okay. If there's no other questions --

MR. HORSEY: When I -- when I said that, did I -- I did take the opportunity to -- to go down and before we even submitted to the Old Georgetown Board to review this with the Zoning Administrator and to -- to clarify some issues and -- and he said that -- that -- that you had a -- you know, because it's -it's theoretically a corner lot and I wanted to confirm that the rear yard is not where it was originally. It was now the side yard and he confirmed that and -- and it was his opinion that -- that removing the non-conforming addition was a positive aspect of this and it was also -- I'm sorry. -- it was his opinion that the attachment -- the removing of the -- the attachment to the garage and the removing of -- of the non-conforming condition was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	a good thing.
2	I asked him about the impact of light and
3	air on the tennis court and the three accessory
4	structures and actually pointed out that one of them
5	was being used as a dwelling and he said well, it
6	can't really be considered a dwelling because it's not
7	allowed by the zoning regulations even if it's there.
8	So, the light and air impact on that can't really be
9	evaluated. Those were his comments.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any other questions?
11	Very well. Cross? No cross. Indeed. Very well. We
12	can move on then.
13	Let's go to the government reports. We do
14	have as already been cited and pointed to, graphics
15	already used.
16	MR. MOORE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and
17	Members of the Board in your new digs.
18	The Office of Planning will stand on the
19	record in support of this application and will
20	entertain any questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We've got things to
22	do this afternoon. We're moving along right away.
23	Good. Any follow-up questions from the Board on the
24	Office of Planning's report?

MEMBER ETHERLY: Very -- very briefly, Mr.

Chair, I think the report was -- was detailed as 1 2 always. 3 Mr. Moore, I'll just ask you the same 4 question that I engaged the applicant's representative 5 in with regard to the tennis court. I think I understand where your report falls on this particular 6 7 question, but could you speak a little bit to any 8 impact on air and light with regard to the introduction of the increased massing on the side near 9 the tennis court? 10 11 MOORE: First, as you mentioned, 12 you're an avid tennis player. I would think that a tennis court that was open on three sides and closed 13 14 on one side once you figure out the air flow, it would 15 give you some sort of an advantage in terms of 16 serving. But -- and also I think that you tennis 17 players also use where there is a wall. I think you 18 19 all call them hitting walls. But, as it relate to 20 light and air, when you look at the direction of the 21 flow for light and air which is east/west, it's not 22 going to be anymore restriction to light and air than 23 is in the existing condition right now. 24 The two-story portion may have some affect 25 on limiting, but I don't think it would be to the

1 extent that it would be very harmful to four people 2 playing on a tennis court. 3 MEMBER ETHERLY: Um-hum. 4 MR. MOORE: They'll still be able to 5 breathe and I think there's more than adequate light that would shine on that court. 6 7 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. 8 MR. MOORE: The impact would probably be 9 in reverse of the applicant and to put up with the 10 pounding of tennis balls as opposed to the -- anyway. My opinion. 11 12 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. And -- and I appreciate that and -- and part of the thrust of my 13 14 questions are one, anticipating some of the testimony 15 that we -- that we may hear from the party opposition and -- and -- and once again, in all -- in 16 17 all seriousness, there is the practical aspect of additional shadows that may conceivably fall on the 18 19 court. 20 Did the Office of Planning or did you in 21 the context of your site visit have 22 opportunity to give some -- some thought to whether or not there would be the introduction of increased 23 24 shadows on the tennis court by virtue of the -- of the

proposed structure?

1	MR. MOORE: If tennis is played on the
2	court during the morning hours, there could be some
3	shadows that because of light coming from the east, of
4	course and across the structure may portions of the
5	court could be a little dark. Again, if you are very
6	good at tennis, you can forget it and make that an
7	advantage.
8	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay.
9	MR. MOORE: Of course, in the afternoon,
10	that maximizes it. You actually would have you'd
11	be able to play later in the afternoon because the sun
12	would be coming in from the west.
13	So, in terms of balance, I think again,
14	there is a minimum effect if any if any.
15	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. Thank you. Thank
16	you, Mr. Chair.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Ms. Miller.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Good afternoon,
19	Mr. Moore. With respect to 223.2(b), the privacy of
20	use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not
21	be unduly compromised, it it seems like if the
22	building is coming closer to the property line that
23	privacy would be decreased at least with respect to
24	the people who are using the tennis court.
25	MR. MOORE: I would totally agree with

1 you, Vice Chair, if it were the house on the east 2 Because the house on the east side of the --3 the structure is actually within maybe 25 or 30 feet 4 of the structure, but I'm hard pressed to make that 5 same statement for a structure that's more than 100 If there were a house even on the other 6 feet away. 7 side of the tennis court. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I'm just 9 talking about enjoyment and use of the tennis court of 10 that part of the property and -- and I'm not even --I would suspect that you would say at least that it --11 12 it -- unduly compromised is -- is a bit further than impacted or decreased, but isn't it impacted somewhat 13 14 if -- if -- if the building is closer to the tennis 15 court? Yes, but again, I think much 16 MR. MOORE: 17 of the impact would be on the applicant's house not the tennis player. 18 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: From the noise 20 of the tennis playing? 21 Maybe that's why it's set MR. MOORE: 22 apart -- that -- in that location on the lot. I don't 23 know. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. 25 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Last thing,

1 do you want to just talk a little bit -- your report 2 indicates that this is not going to visually intrude 3 on the character, scale or pattern. 4 testified to the fact that this is a kind of eclectic 5 neighborhood. Of course, it is an R-1-B zone. don't find that moving this structure to the property 6 7 line is out of character with the pattern and the 8 scale of the houses and the street frontage? 9 MR. MOORE: No, I don't, Mr. Chair. 10 matter of fact, if you look at the OP photograph that the applicant offered, I guess it would be to the 11 south right across the block. 12 There's a large structure there. I think you can almost see that 13 14 there's been the same kind of additions to the top of the building, of the house recently. 15 I couldn't exactly get up in there, but if 16 17 you look directly across from the subject property on the south side of the block. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum. 20 The structure here. MR. MOORE: You can 21 almost see that there's been this similar kind of 22 addition put on that house. So, when I said that it's 23 basically match the character of the neighborhood, 24 it's looking at the same kind thing that's happened

already in the community.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything
2	else? Any other questions?
3	Does the applicant have any cross of the
4	Office of Planning?
5	MR. HORSEY: I do do want to just cite
6	this. Took the opportunity to review the original
7	commission order that instituted these regulations and
8	the Office of Planning
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have any
10	questions or cross of Mr. Moore?
11	MR. HORSEY: Oh, no, but I wanted to cite
12	something they had said.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And I'll give
14	you follow up for
15	MR. HORSEY: Okay. All right. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: conclusions once
17	I get through everything. Does the applicant have any
18	cross of Office of Planning or the party in
19	opposition?
20	MS. GIORDANO: No, not at all.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any cross? Okay.
22	Very well. Let's continue on then with government
23	reports. We do have has been cited the Exhibit
24	Number 21 in our record which is the Commission of
25	Fine Arts, Old Georgetown Historic Board submission.

Τ	ANC-2E. Is the ANC member present? ANC-2E.
2	We have the ANC recommending approval of
3	the application is Exhibit Number 23. I'll give an
4	opportunity for the Board to comment on that if need
5	be. Not hearing any opportunity or need for that,
6	that's all the government reports attendant to the
7	application that I have.
8	Let me ask if there are persons in support
9	of the applicant here today to provide testimony?
10	Persons in support.
11	Come on up and pick a comfortable chair.
12	Sure if you'd like.
13	Well, I'm going to have you there he
14	is. He's handing you a mike.
15	Of course, persons presenting testimony
16	are allotted three minutes. I'll keep track of that
17	and good.
18	MR. GABRIEL: My name is Robert Gabriel
19	and I am the neighbor immediately to the east of the
20	Stettinius subject property. My wife and three kids,
21	family live in this property here. I'm just going to
22	sort of do this visually because I think it's will
23	make it a little clearer.
24	So, we have the property that is north of
25	their front yard, east of their house about 20 20

1 feet to the east as -- as Mr. Bailey alluded and we 2 also own this 900 lot to the north of their house. 3 So, we're sort of on all sides. 4 We are very much in support of the 5 Stettinius' proposed project. We have across our side yard eight or ten rental buildings that have non-6 7 conforming setbacks. They're built right up to their 8 property line and almost into our back yard. There's 9 a slight alley that separates us. So, I can -- I can appreciate setbacks. 10 11 We did an addition to our house a couple 12 of years ago. The Stettinius were very supportive and very patient with our project and I think their 13 14 request for relief here would be -- would be a huge improvement over the existing conditions. 15 It would 16 connect their house to the garage. 17 light and air would be somewhat impacted, but -- but it really doesn't -- doesn't 18 19 phase us. 20 And as far as, you know, them being good 21 neighbors and -- and having done everything they've 22 said they're going to do, in the two years that we've 23 lived there, they've been very above board and -- and straightforward with us. 24 25 That's really it. I'm -- I'm just -- I'm

1	here as the immediate neighbor. These both these
2	houses were constructed in the late '40s and we we
3	are very much in support of their their project.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
6	Is there questions from the Board?
7	Mr. Horsey, do you have any cross
8	examination of the witness?
9	Ms. Giordano, any cross?
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
11	Anybody else? Persons present. Very well then. I
12	think we're ready. Party in opposition. Unless
13	there's persons present in opposition that would like
14	to go first. Is there anyone else that wants to
15	testify before the Board? Okay.
16	MS. GIORDANO: Good afternoon. For the
17	record, my name's Cynthia Giordano.
18	We're just handing three items to the
19	Board. The first one is just to add a little levity
20	to the afternoon. It's a cartoon from yesterday's
21	Washington Post which we thought was really kind of
22	funny on the eve of this hearing.
23	First of all, we'd like to request about
24	ten minutes if that's okay with the Board. We've got
25	a couple of witnesses. The Friendlys here are

represented by Lucinda Friendly to my left and Alfred
Friendly. The property is owned in trust for three
siblings, the Friendly family. Five. Sorry. I've
met three, I think, of the five.

And Nate Gross to my far left is -- is
from Arnold & Porter as you know. He had some

from Arnold & Porter as you know. He had some involvement previously when he was on the Office of Planning Staff with bringing this special exception provision to the Zoning Commission. So, he is going to testify on the intent of the -- the regulation as well as the impacts on the abutting property.

And I think we all understand by now that the -- the Friendlys own the property immediately to the west of the subject property and that the side yard which would be eliminated with this addition immediately abuts the tennis courts located on their property.

Their property's about three-quarters of an acre. It's been in the family for some time and initially, they did -- they were inclined to support this special exception.

The property was -- is on the market and it was under contract. They had a purchaser that lived in Georgetown and was very familiar with the -- the property and the setting and unfortunately, when

1 the contract purchaser learned of this BZA case, they 2 basically voided the contract and --3 MR. HORSEY: Mr. Chairman, can -- can I 4 object to this testimony? We've -- we've heard this 5 several times in the regulatory hearing. We have no proof of this. This is what they call hearsay. 6 7 don't know why these people withdrew. This -- this is 8 a very old house. Needs a huge amount of money. 9 know, it could be a million reasons. MS. GIORDANO: Well, the -- the Friendlys 10 can testify themselves on that, but I'm explaining --11 12 I'd like to --MR. HORSEY: MS. GIORDANO: -- I -- I think it's very 13 14 pertinent. You indicated that the Friendlys supported this initially and I think it's important to explain 15 16 why they have changed their position and this was the precipitating event and it really became clear to them 17 at that point that this proposal has an impact on the 18 19 property and they will speak more directly to that, 20 but I -- I did want to explain the reason for -- the 21 precipitating reason for the change of heart and their 22 understanding about how this proposal would affect 23 their property. 24 With that, I would like to ask 25 Friendly to provide his remarks.

1 MR. FRIENDLY: Thank you very much. Thank 2 you, Mr. Chair. 3 My name is Alfred Friendly. My -- in 4 addition to my sister, my brother Nicholas is here. 5 The other two trustees of the property are -- don't -don't live in Washington and couldn't -- couldn't be 6 7 present. 8 My concern is to be sure that you all -that the Board understands that at tennis court is 9 just as much a matter of concern under Section 223 as 10 anybody else's backyard, the Stettinius pool and so 11 12 forth. The -- in the case of our property, the 13 14 tennis court is a particularly valuable part of the 15 It's the reason we own the property. property. In 1939, my mother persuaded my father to 16 come to look at it. He wouldn't even look at the 17 house, but he did walk off the space in the backyard, 18 19 agreed that a tennis court would go in there and 20 agreed with my mother who at that point had two 21 children that the great big house, the third floor 22 could be rented. It was all right. She could buy it. 23 She had three more children and the third floor got 24 very busy. 25 So did the tennis court. It was an extension of our family life. It's where my parents taught us all to play tennis. It's where we brought our friends to play tennis. It's where my parents brought the charities that they cared about to stage fund raising benefits and those were the Community Council for the Aging, I'm sorry, Community Council for the Homeless, the Arts for the Aging, Fillmore Arts Center, and the Alliance Francaise among others.

That was a court where our -- one of our extended family members taught kids from the Metropolitan Police Boys and Girls Club which is around the corner from our house to play tennis for several years.

For thirty years, it was an extension of my father's professional life as well. It's where he brought -- he was a reporter and the managing editor of The Washington Post which is not why that cartoon got in yesterday. We have a long reach, but we don't have that kind of clout. The -- he brought his sources, his colleagues. It was a morale builder. It was very important on -- on all kinds of fronts and it still it.

He died in 1983. My mother ten years later began to feel fragile which it turned out she really wasn't, but she decided that to keep the

property in the family was -- much the best way to go was to keep it -- to put it in trust for the five of us so that we would have the latitude, the possibility of continuing to own it as a rental property or buying each other out. Unfortunately, none of us has won the lottery and that option isn't really a real one.

And when she died in January of this year and we put her ashes with my father's by the tree by the side of the tennis court, we all faced the reality that we really had to sell the house.

And at about the same time that Joe who was being very helpful as a neighbor, those vines are important, he's helped put the tennis court in shape. He and Reg returned the balls that fall into the pool or let us go into their side yard to retrieve them. At about the same time that he approached us on the issue of the special exception, we were trying to set up a way to put the house on the market.

It went on the market and it sold very, very quickly to our considerable surprise. It sold to exactly the kind of people we wanted to sell it to.

Another family. They happened, in fact, to live three blocks down the street and they bought it because they're tennis players. That's kind of a luxury.

They pulled out of the contract at some

	241
1	cost to themselves, and if the Board would like, we
2	can certainly produce the documentation of that
3	transaction, because they became aware of the plans
4	and the request for the special exception.
5	
6	We want to sell it to a family. We think
7	it's still possible. We have been told rather our
8	at least our brokers have been told they got an
9	opinion from an attorney, I think he may know him,
10	Wayne Quinn.
11	MS. GIORDANO: Mr. Quinn.
12	MR. FRIENDLY: The lot is so big, it could
13	be broken up into a into two at least two,
14	perhaps three more lots and developed. We don't want
15	to see that happen. We want to use we want to find
16	a family, we believe we can again, that will use the
17	property as we have and use it, I stress, the whole
18	property, who will enjoy it themselves as we have and
19	who'll preserve the court and the yard as open space
20	as we have for the benefit of themselves, their
21	friends, our neighbors and the entire Georgetown
22	community.
23	Thank you.
24	MS. GIORDANO: Our next witness is Lucinda

Friendly and Lucinda has done some study of the

1 impacts on the tennis court particularly with related 2 -- with relation to the shadows, light and air on the tennis court and the drainage of the tennis court. 3 4 MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Thank you for 5 listening to our concerns. I am the third of the five generations who have been under the roof of that house 6 7 and I've lived in D.C. most of my life and been active in D.C. affairs, the six-school complex, the public 8 9 schools right near by. 10 And I spent the first 20 years as landscape -- a landscape designer and I've done lots 11 12 of designs around Georgetown and have some sense of light, water, air and so forth. I just bring that as 13 14 some sort of a credential. I did that for 20 years. 15 And, however, the last 20 years I have 16 been an artist and I work in the building. There are the three accessory buildings. The one closest to the 17 Stettinius property is a two-car garage which I have 18 19 appropriated half of mostly for storage of paintings. 20 It doesn't have anything else in it, but racks and 21 paintings. 22 next building The was originally 23 carriage house and that's where I have been working 24 for 20 years and the next building, it was a stable

which my parents converted to staff quarters I think

in '79 with all the permits required. It is a legal dwelling. I just wanted to bring that up and, therefore, the court is closed in on the south side.

I have been working in that studio for 20 years and I've seen it rain and I see what happens on the tennis court with regard to light and air and basically, I have -- I have really four -- four concerns which I'll address very, very briefly. Some of them have already been raised.

The main thing to know -- one of the main things to know is the court is made of clay. It is a red clay court with a hard true finish. It's a kind of a gray gravel. It's one of the few soft courts if you want to call it that and the reason it's soft when it rains, you can't walk on it or play on it until it dries. It's very important it be able to dry if you're going to use it. You can't -- literally can't walk on it much less play on it. So, my concern is with the light and the air and the water very definitely.

It would also be very hard for us to plant anything on our side because it's clay and when it's wet, it's really wet and when it's not, things don't grow terribly well in clay. So, the idea of being able to grow vines up their house is not necessarily

a reality.

2.0

Almost 80 percent of our land drains in the direction of the Stettinius property as -- and their property and the Gabriel's all drain to the east towards Avon. So, the water which does not sink into the water table on our property and not all of it does when it rains heavily, maybe a quarter of the court might have standing water on it in the heavy thunderstorms in the summertime and that water drains to the east side of the court, the Stettinius side and to the south corner of that area there where we have a -- a dry well and a drain.

But, even with that, there -- it takes a long time sometimes after a rainstorm for the water to dissipate from the court. A lot of it sits against a little tiny retaining wall on which that fence is placed and it sits there for quite some time, goes down into the water table because is a ten-foot gap between the edge of the court and the existing building.

I'm concerned that the construction of the foundations right on the property line even though I guess the wall will not be centered on the property line, I think Mr. Horsey told me he'll put it right on -- he'll do the footings, but not center the wall.

He'll put it right against the -- those footings, those foundations will prevent that water which has now got a way to go down and some time before it encounters the existing foundations, that will not be an option. So, I worry about the foundations. That's one of my concerns.

The other one is that when -- and you can see -- I think you can -- if you -- you have this background document and if you look, you can -- when you see this. This is the fence we're talking about. This is the -- the garage, my studio which was a carriage house and the other building is out of the picture in that. You can barely see this little retaining wall in that photograph on page one.

It's tiny. It's three inches high. It -it only -- I mean we don't get water higher than that,
but we can have water standing there and so, I'm
concerned about the foundations.

In addition, I'm concerned about the -the next page, if you go to page two, my brother got
up and took some photos early in the morning and you
can see it. We're close to the -- to the equinox
right now. So, this sort of gives you a rough idea of
the sunlight, but you can see how the shadow is now
and how it will be. So, it'll be considerably --

1 several hours more before the sunlight will hit that 2 most damp area of the tennis court. The court that --3 the part that most needs to have light. 4 In addition by closing off the connection 5 between the house and the garage, the -- the wind which in the summertime is prevailing southeast will 6 7 be entirely cutoff. So, that wind which helps us after thunderstorms and things like that will not be 8 9 available to dry that area of the court. So, we'll have the foundations and no --10 less wind and less light making it harder to have that 11 12 area dry. Additionally, one concern I have, I'm not 13 14 quite clear on, is if the wall is sitting right on the 15 property line, what happens to the rainwater coming 16 off these new -- the new roof? Will there be a 17 gutter? Will it project over our land? I am also concerned that it -- and how 18 19 will they maintain it and if there is a gutter, I know 20 tennis balls get stuck in gutters and even downspouts 21 because I quite frequently climb fence. In -- on page 22 three, you can see the garage and I quite often have 23 to climb this fence to take the tennis balls out of 24 the gutter or the downspouts there because they stick.

Now, that possibly -- I just don't -- I'm

not quite clear from the plans what how that water
will be dealt with, but I feel that the that we
will lose I don't I can't really guess how many
days a year or how much time, but I definitely think
that our enjoyment and use of the tennis court will be
impacted for sure by this construction and so, I hope
you will take that in those concerns into your
deliberations.
Thank you so much.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
MS. GIORDANO: Our last witness is Mr.
Gross.
MR. GROSS: Afternoon, Members of the
Board. I'm Nathan W. Gross for the record.
First, I'd like to point out that in the
northern part of Georgetown there is a substantial R-
1-B District outlined in yellow on this map. It
extends over almost to 25th Street on the east. It
includes the subject area.
You can see the difference in density of
development in the R-3 townhouse section of the
neighborhood compared with the intent of the single-
family neighborhood in the R-1-B.
Of course, being an historic area, there
are indeed some non-conforming structures, but the

248 intent of the R-1-B District relating to the side yard provisions before us today is an eight-foot side yard beside a detached house. In effect, creating a 16foot open space domain between two detached houses. Even in the R-3 and R-4 zones, a detached house still requires the two eight-foot side yards. So, the zoning regulations are quite strong in this intent. The proposed addition imposes very substantial end to the entirety of this side yard in the relevant area. The two-story addition is 29 feet long and the one-story addition is 20 feet long. you have the entirety of a ten foot seven inch

existing side yard completely built on for a length of 49 feet.

This connects with an existing 20-foot garage for a total distance of 69 feet occupying the side yard setback area and we believe that's directly contrary to the intent of the zoning regulations and you see it graphically in the isometric, two and half story and the one story.

Until today, it was our understanding that the -- the existing ivy colored -- covered fence would come down, but you can see the contrast. You have an existing vine-covered fence. Behind it is a ten foot

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

seven foot side yard and then -- and then you have a sheer wall even if it's covered with a fence somehow and I'm not sure how feasible that would be.

This is quite an imposition aesthetically and I would submit from the backyard, it's -- it's an encroachment visually.

As to windows, I would note that part of the intent of the zoning regulations is those windows are suppose to be eight feet away. These existing windows are ten foot seven inches away and so, the number of windows may remain about the same, but there's quite a difference when they're on the property line.

I would also comment that if this were a fence, it's maximum height would be eight feet under the building code. Whereas, here we have substantially more height obviously.

Also regarding distance from the Friendly's house, I would say that in most side yard variance cases what happens is you have a rear edition on a house that comes back to about the same depth -- depth as the adjacent house, but then they want to go off to the side and they have side windows going into the neighbor's yard and I think more often than not, it's privacy of the use of the yard rather than --

rather than windows -- looking at windows in the adjacent house that's at issue in the side yard variance cases.

I want to read a comment and testimony made by the Office of Planning when Section 223 was adopted. "Homeowners, architects and builders should look first to a matter-of-right addition and only apply for special exception relief if there case has significant need and merit."

I would add that the Board of Zoning Adjustment which referred this issue to the Zoning Commission suggested that a case should be made kind of showing that you can't really do a reasonable addition without this special exception. It's not suppose to be just virtually a matter of right.

And in the instant case, we have 24 percent lot occupancy and one would think that with all this rear yard to work with something matter of right could be done. Pretty obviously you have a simple back porch with a roof held up by four posts. That could be removed and a substantial addition be built there, two or three stories possibly including a porch on the ground level without putting all this mass into the side yard setback area

And based on all these considerations, we

1 would request denial of the application. 2 Clarifying point, MR. FRIENDLY: 3 Horsey. Mr. Horsey mentioned our -- our discussion 4 with Joe and -- you know, about the windows. That was 5 in May and my understanding, it could have been wrong, was that because it was to be a wall on the property 6 7 line, the technology to be used would be firebrick 8 which is opaque. I understand that technology has advanced. The windows can be made so that you can see 9 10 through them. Thank you. MS. GIORDANO: Thank you. Any questions 11 12 from the Board? VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. 13 14 couple. 15 Mr. Gross, I just wonder if you can perhaps elaborate a little bit more on your statement 16 that this is clearly contrary to the intent of the 17 zoning regulations and I think you mean on top of --18 19 of a finding of, you know, whether light and air or 20 privacy are impacted that this -- this particular 21 situation is beyond that. A violation of the intent 22 of the zoning regulations. MR. GROSS: Yes, indeed, Ms. Miller. 23 24 point is that the intent of the zoning regulations 25 prefers matter-of-right development. Then -- then a degree of relief is an exception, but it is an exception and then you have the variance and when the Board recommended this Section 223 and the Zoning Commission adopted it, I don't think they meant for it to be virtually a matter of right. There's still the general concept in the R-1 zones of an eight-foot side yard on -- on both properties.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you and Ms. Friendly, I -- I -- I'm still a little bit confused about this fence with the vine. Whether it's -- it's -- it's staying where it is or whether it would have to be moved onto the clay of your -- of the tennis courts.

MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: At the moment, the -- it's -- the fence pictured, it sits on a little tiny retaining wall. It's some cinder block and we put a little extra brick on it. I don't even know that it's cemented in and that fence sits on that wall on our property and we'd prefer not to have the fence removed. I do use it to climb up and get tennis balls, but I'm not sure if this permit is granted what we would do. I mean there wouldn't be a lot of point having a kitchen window that slams right up against a fence that is completely covered with ivy. Why put the window in?

I -- I don't know whether once -- if the building were constructed and a new owner bought the property, they're certainly welcome to take down the fence. It is on our property and ordinarily, we would not want to take -- take the fence down. It has its uses. We had vines growing on it. They weren't as dense as this and I don't know where the roots came from, but there's a beautiful porcelain berry vine that always ran up every summer and ran across the top of the fence and I think that vine is still there despite the ivy, but it's sort of buried in it and I don't where the roots of that are. They're certainly not obvious on our side.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And I also just want to just clarify that the testimony of both -- of you, Mr. and -- both Mr. and Mrs. Friendly, that -- that -- that the use and enjoyment would be impacted by number one, privacy. Number two, there would be more shadows so that the conditions wouldn't be as comfortable to play tennis in and --

MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: It's not even so much a question of comfort. It's a question of whether we could even play. My -- my fear is that the added water unable to drain out to the east would keep the -- because its clay, it'll sit there and

1	conceivably, it could could be a problem for the
2	edition because that water's going to be sitting
3	against those foundations sometimes for days down
4	underneath, but I don't know. I just my concern is
5	that that we would literally not be able to use the
6	court because it would be too wet because of the loss
7	of light and air and the foundations and possibly
8	overflow from the gutters. But, I don't understand
9	the gutters. So, I can't really
10	MR. FRIENDLY: It just isn't the tennis
11	court water. The water the rain water that lands
12	on the court is most of the water that goes across the
13	court, but some of the water that goes across the
14	court comes from elsewhere on the property. The
15	problem is it builds in that southeast corner. That's
16	exactly where the new shadows would fall and exactly
17	where the air would be blocked.
18	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Most of the property
19	is
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It builds up now
21	or the
22	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: It even now there
23	is some, but because there is light and air and the
24	possibility of the water going into the water table,
25	it drains usually relatively fast. I mean spring and

fall -- or spring, we have to wait until it dries. In the fall, we usually play sometimes December, even the first of January, but then the spring months, we have to wait for it dry. We put it in shape. Every year you have to work on it and get it back in shape and then as soon as it's dry, we start to play.

What I'm concerned about is both the spring drying will be much delayed and the summer which is our prime time we love to play, those thunderstorms which are so heavy, the water, as my brother points out, comes across a good deal of the property and sometimes comes -- we have a retaining wall this -- where the -- where you can't really see, but this is a probably three-foot retaining wall on the west side, but sometimes I have watched water come pouring out the underneath of that wall in the heavy rainstorms and go -- travel across the court to the Stettinius side and sit there. Some of it goes into the drain.

The drain has -- in -- in -- the neighbor before, a lovely gentleman, was having problems with water stand -- the water from our property, the tennis court and so forth standing against his footings which were -- which are now ten feet seven inches away and he asked if we could do something about it and we

1	worked together and put the drain which drained out
2	through that property and he had no further problems.
3	So, I don't know where that water's going
4	to go. It's if there aren't drains there, it's
5	going to sit against those foundations and there's
6	nothing we can do about it. We can't change the
7	drainage of the entire property or even of the tennis
8	court.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
10	(Whereupon, at 5:02 p.m. the evening
11	session began.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	257
1	
2	
3	E-V-E-N-I-N-G S-E-S-S-I-O-N
4	5:02 p.m.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You mentioned the
6	ivy growing on the fence. How high is the highest
7	point of the fence? Do you know?
8	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: It looks about ten
9	feet. It's the height of that garage which I think is
10	a ten-foot garage.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, it steps up to
12	a higher higher height?
13	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: No, it's consistent
14	all the way. That's their trees. Those are trees
15	that the Stettinius have planted that are the higher
16	ones.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, there's some
18	trees in the
19	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Those are trees.
20	They planted lots of trees and have beautiful
21	screening for the swimming pool and also the dust that
22	would be coming. You know, if somebody plays, it's
23	when it's dry, it's a little dusty. So, those trees

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

protect their pool and backyard and side yard from --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

24

1	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: everything.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Now, I'm not sure I
3	understand this, but briefly, there's the water that's
4	flowing now. You said that there's the retaining wall
5	that's there. It's about three inches high off of the
6	court and the water never raises above that level and
7	that's where it sits.
8	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Correct. On the
9	other side it drops.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, when you put a
11	building there
12	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Pardon.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: If you put a wall
14	there, what would be the different condition?
15	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: If you put a wall
16	there, it has to have footings. This is a little
17	a little wall. I doubt that it goes down more than a
18	foot, maybe two. I don't know what that fence sits
19	on. I've never dug it up.
20	On the Stettinius side, there is more of
21	a drop.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Explain the drain.
23	There's a drain there.
24	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Yes, there
25	current, there is a drain in this corner. If you look

on page -- it's kind of messy because we're trying to work on it and make it even better. Page three. In that corner were the garage meets that ivy-covered fence, there is a drain there. So, there -- this -- the -- this -- and you can see the little -- it's the -- the height of a brick, that retaining wall on our side. It drops down a foot -- 18 inches on the Stettinius side. So, it's not much of a retaining wall. But, it keeps the clay and the court in and -- and -- but, we have a drain that -- in that corner, but it just takes time and it --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm trying to understand what -- what -- what the different -- what the impact would be. How would the condition change?

Whether --

MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Instead of having this much of a footing, you would have whatever. I mean I presume if they're going to build a two-story wall, that you're going to have some pretty good foundations right there against the property line that the water will have to run down. Instead of just being able to go down and through gradually, it will be held against that foundation wall I presume. I don't know how deep the foundations have to go, but I presume they're going to be a lot -- one, they're

1 going to be a lot closer and two, I presume they're 2 going to be a lot more solid and a lot deeper. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 4 MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Making it more 5 difficult for the water to flow in the direction it wants to flow, i.e., east. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 8 MS. GIORDANO: Are there any other 9 questions from the Board? MEMBER MANN: Yes, Mr. Friendly, you said 10 that the tennis court was particularly valuable, but 11 12 it was unclear to me at the conclusion of your testimony whether or not that value is economic value 13 14 or sentimental value. MR. FRIENDLY: I think it's -- it's -- the 15 court itself -- the court itself is -- is --16 17 MEMBER MANN: You -- you said that -- you said the tennis court was particularly valuable. 18 19 MR. FRIENDLY: As a -- as something 20 that makes the property itself unique and something 21 that has a history. But, it's the uniqueness and as 22 -- since we are now obliged to try and sell the 23 property, it's an -- a very significant asset unless 24 we decided to sell it to a developer whom -- and I 25 don't think anybody in the neighborhood or anybody in

1	the community and certainly nobody in our family wants
2	that to happen.
3	MEMBER MANN: Regarding those sort of
4	aspirations for a buyer, are you going to place or
5	have you placed any sort of covenant or restriction
6	MR. FRIENDLY: I'm sorry. I'm more than
7	a little deaf.
8	MEMBER MANN: In in regard to the
9	aspirations that you have for a particular buyer
10	MR. FRIENDLY: Um-hum.
11	MEMBER MANN: have you placed any sorts
12	of covenants or restrictions to insure that there's no
13	subdivision of the property or that
14	MR. FRIENDLY: No.
15	MEMBER MANN: nothing of that sort
16	happens.
17	And I'm not certain who can answer this
18	one, but why was your initial support of this project
19	withdrawn?
20	MR. FRIENDLY: Why was it withdrawn?
21	MEMBER MANN: Yes.
22	MR. FRIENDLY: Because because the sale
23	the collapse of the sale to the perfect buyer
24	frankly at a price that was lower than we had
25	initially asked because they were the perfect buyer.

Fell through when they became aware of the plans and 1 2 said I'd be happy to provide the lawyers' letters that 3 use the terms of Section 223 about the privacy of use 4 enjoyment is the reason we are voiding the 5 contract. MEMBER MANN: Thank you. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to 8 ask a follow-up question to that. I mean based on 9 your experience with that one purchase at least --10 MR. FRIENDLY: Again, I'm really sorry. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 11 I'm sorry. Ι want to follow up on Mr. Mann's --12 MR. FRIENDLY: Yes. 13 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: -- questions about the value of the tennis court. 15 16 MR. FRIENDLY: Um-hum. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: From what I 18 heard you say, I think that anyone who was interested 19 in buying your property as a whole would be interested 20 in it in large part because of the tennis court and 21 that if -- correct me if I'm wrong because this is 22 what I -- I -- I thought you were saying and that, 23 therefore, if the tennis court was impacted so that a lot of time it wouldn't be able to be used because of 24

the water or lack of drying, privacy, et cetera, the

1 value of the property as a whole would be diminished. 2 MR. FRIENDLY: I don't mean to be flip, 3 but if Averill Harriman were alive or Joe Fowler both 4 of whom were croquet fiends wanted the property, 5 they'd probably turn the tennis court into a croquet They wouldn't want it wet either. 6 7 The -- it is a -- a space, an enormous in 8 Georgetown almost unique open space. There's one 9 other property called Evermay which is 10 foundation. There's one on -- just off Reservoir Road that's shared by two properties. No other clay courts 11 12 that I know of in Georgetown. Finally, they've put some at -- at Hains Point. 13 14 It's not just that it's a tennis court. 15 It's a clay court for people with knees that are not as good as Mr. Etherly's. Clay is a really important 16 surface and I -- I'm 67 and I still try and play once 17 a day and I even run around. I couldn't do that on a 18 19 hard court, but it's -- the -- the court is a -- the 20 property is -- is -- is special, but one of the -- the 21 thing that makes the property so special is -- three-22 quarters of it is the court. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right. Thank 24 you. 25 MR. FRIENDLY: Two-thirds/three-quarters.

1 MEMBER ETHERLY: Well, if I could just --2 just one -- one question and -- and this might perhaps 3 be directed to Mr. Gross or -- or if either of the 4 Friendlys would like to respond to it or even Ms. 5 Giordano. what's to that you don't 6 But, say 7 necessarily simply just have a drainage issue? that isn't necessarily going to be exacerbated or --8 9 or ameliorated in any extent by the -- by any 10 construction on the adjacent property. What's to say you're just simply dealing with an environmental 11 12 condition that is just part and parcel of the property that you have? 13 14 And I'm open to -- to --15 MS. GIORDANO: Right. It's -- it's a --16 MEMBER ETHERLY: -- you know, being --17 MS. GIORDANO: -- it's a light and air 18 issue as well. The light and the air affect the 19 drying of the tennis court regardless of what the 20 I mean clay is not going to drain drainage is. 21 quickly. 22 MEMBER ETHERLY: Correct. 23 MS. GIORDANO: But, I think, you know, I 24 think that anybody looking at this situation would 25 rather not have a house right on a property line, you

1 know, adjacent to you. I mean that's the whole point 2 of a side yard. I mean I -- I just think it's a very 3 obvious thing regardless of the unique aspects of the 4 clay court and all. It obviously impacts this 5 property. If you were looking to purchase this 6 7 property or you've lived on this site, I mean how 8 would you feel about it? I mean the -- the other 9 neighbors aren't abutting this new addition. It's --10 it's -- to me, it's -- it's -- it's just self-evident. Thank you. 11 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. 12 Appreciate it. MS. GIORDANO: And I -- I just want to add 13 14 to that that it's not an issue of beggaring my 15 neighbors or, you know, suggesting that the neighbors shouldn't have as large a house as they want, but 16 17 there -- there appears to be ample room on this 18 property for an addition without encroaching upon the 19 abutting property. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Gross, just to 21 follow up on your question, I think it raises some 22 interest in the Board and that is the -- the question 23 of -- the intent of the zoning regulations is to move 24 the property owner to add or build in compliance with

I don't think anyone would refute

the regulations.

1 that in terms of that's why we have regulations. 2 However, we do have the relief valves and 3 it comes in special exceptions and variances. 4 You made the comment though, however, that 5 one should pursue the matter of right first prior to moving and certainly, in the rear of this structure, 6 7 it would be easy enough to do. Here we have just a 8 covered porch. 9 Are you aware of what's on the second floor of this house? 10 MR. GROSS: No, I'm not getting into room 11 layouts or what the architect would have to do. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And -- and 13 14 this is -- I just want to go because nor am I and nor 15 am I perhaps able to assess this, but conceivably 16 there are bedrooms on that floor. elongate that house and facilitate the utilization of 17 what they're proposing to do in terms of -- in terms 18 19 of the new space that's provided? 20 My point being is -- is what they're --21 what they're proposing in their massing of the one-22 story and two structure, is that analogous to just 23 putting an addition on the rear of the structure or is 24 there some use and spacial relation to the house 25 itself?

MR. GROSS: My point is that very often an architect designing an addition will first show the homeowner three conceptual alternatives and before going to details and very often these might involve rearranging uses within the existing house, combining a couple of rooms and do something that might be -- if you did option A, that particular function might be in the addition. If you did option B and it's at the rear, maybe the functions change and use the interior in different ways and obviously, they're -- they're issues of connecting with certain rooms and access points and stairways and I'm obviously not qualified to do it, but -- but --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. GROSS: -- design -- is setting a direction here and we're just saying that they should look at that first.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, and -- and I think that's an important clarification. Neither you nor I as I understand what you're saying understand the interiors or the layouts of this, but what you're saying, your assessing is certainly we'd hope if not -- you would -- I guess if I'm understanding you correctly, you're asserting that options should have been pursued if they were not. Is that correct?

1 MR. GROSS: That is correct. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Ms. Miller. 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes, I just have one more follow up for Mr. Gross. Because I've looked 4 5 at the regulations on the special exception and the legislative history and -- and I've seen the comments 6 7 of Office of Planning or -- or why the Board asked for these regulations to being with and I think it makes 8 9 sense, you know, to look at whether or not they could have done an addition that didn't encroach on the 10 11 property. 12 But, I didn't see that that -- it didn't make it into the regulation per se and -- and I don't 13 know whether you have a comment as to why we can --14 15 can interpret the -- the -- the intent of the regulation that way when it didn't make it into the 16 regulation itself. 17 Well, I think it's just the 18 MR. GROSS: 19 difference between the word matter of right and the 20 word exception. I mean matter of right is what you can do by just applying for a building permit and 21 22 exception is something that might be a good thing or 23 it might not be good thing. So, you have a public hearing to decide whether it is. 24

So, I mean I think the preference is

1	always matter of right.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
3	MS. GIORDANO: If I can just add onto
4	that, I think matter of right assumes that the the
5	standards that we have in the city for impacting
6	adjacent properties are met and an exception requires
7	a review of that. That's the whole point of the
8	exception.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Gross said we
10	don't make it easy. In fact, we turned off the air
11	conditioning.
12	MS. GIORDANO: I noticed that.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Any other
14	questions from the Board? Very well. Cross.
15	MR. HORSEY: I do.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Couple of questions.
17	Good. Why don't we get you a comfortable chair next
18	to a microphone up there?
19	MR. HORSEY: Just a a couple of
20	questions. Outerbridge Horsey for the applicant.
21	About the drainage.
22	I can address you, Alfred.
23	Isn't it true that in the initial
24	agreement with Joe and Reg that where you initially
25	gave your support which you withdrew as is, of course,

1	your right, that you that they agreed to accept and
2	and improve at their own expense the drainage for
3	the tennis court?
4	MR. FRIENDLY: I don't what they
5	MR. HORSEY: Isn't that
6	MR. FRIENDLY: I don't what they
7	MR. HORSEY: Would you like me to read it?
8	MR. FRIENDLY: I have I have their
9	letter, but I don't have anything binding, Mr. Horsey,
10	from them. Any we talked about it. Drainage was
11	then a very significant matter. I thought we were on
12	the same
13	MR. HORSEY: Well, what do you mean
14	binding? Let me ask you. Was it part of the
15	agreement? And we can ask corporation counsel
16	MR. FRIENDLY: We don't have an agreement,
17	sir.
18	MR. HORSEY: Oh, okay. You don't have an
19	agreement. So, you're saying now that you never
20	agreed to support them. I thought you said
21	MR. FRIENDLY: I don't have that
22	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: My brother is one of
23	five trustees.
24	MR. FRIENDLY: No. No, it's not that
25	Lucinda.
	•

	_ · · _
1	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: Oh, all right.
2	MR. FRIENDLY: But, I mean
3	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: We don't have an
4	agreement anyway.
5	MR. FRIENDLY: By agreement, do you mean
6	an informal agreement? It certainly was. As
7	MR. HORSEY: I have a signed letter to the
8	ANC. I have a signed letter from you.
9	MS. GIORDANO: I don't I don't
10	personally don't think this is appropriate. I mean I
11	think he's clearly badgering Mr. Friendly.
12	MR. HORSEY: Well, all right.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What we're going to
14	do is just simple questions on cross and simple
15	answers.
16	MR. HORSEY: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: If they can be
18	constantly yes or no, that's appropriate and I think
19	I understand your your your question and that is
20	was there or is there an agreement that the applicant
21	would take care of the drainage during the
22	construction of their addition?
23	MR. HORSEY: And and in perpetuity.
24	MR. FRIENDLY: There was a letter which
25	I'd be glad to submit for the record from the

1 applicant. I think you might have it in the record. 2 From the applicant to us on May 26th. Very -- very clearly spelling out exactly what Mr. Horsey is asking 3 4 about. 5 The response to that letter was our statement of the assent to the ANC and the Old 6 7 Georgetown Board. It did not incorporate specific 8 reference to -- to the letter of May 26th. It talked 9 about drainage. It talked in general terms and it 10 talked about the windows in general terms, too. But, then there was a letter -- there was 11 to have been a letter of indemnification which we 12 haven't yet received. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Understood. Tt.'s 15 It's not agreed upon. Next question. out there. MR. HORSEY: Well, the -- the real point 16 17 of my question is that -- is aren't you in the process of now installing a drain to take care of the drainage 18 19 and taking it into the street? 20 MR. FRIENDLY: It will -- it will take 21 care of the drainage of the property as it now exists 22 with the light and air that comes onto it and without 23 any blockage of -- of the drainage that now exists. 24 MR. HORSEY: So, I take your answer to be 25 yes.

	2.0
1	MS. GIORDANO: He already stated
2	MR. HORSEY: Thank you.
3	MS. FRIENDLY MURPHY: He showed the
4	picture with the the digging.
5	MR. HORSEY: That's the only that's the
6	only question I have.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very good. Any
8	redirect?
9	MS. GIORDANO: No.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Very well.
11	Thank you all very much.
12	MS. GIORDANO: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We do appreciate it
14	and thank you for being patient and being with us most
15	of the day.
16	Let's move ahead then for any
17	MR. FRIENDLY: Oh
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, sir.
19	MR. FRIENDLY: Okay. Sorry. Thank you
20	very much.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Let's go to
22	questions from the Board. First and follow ups after
23	that testimony and then are you presenting rebuttal
24	testimony or going right to conclusions?
25	MR. HORSEY: I'm presenting rebuttal
I	

1 testimony to some of the things they said. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Why 3 don't we go ahead with that then. MR. HORSEY: I think first we should deal 4 5 with the issue of the drainage. Ms. testimony focused in large part on that. 6 I think --7 it's my understanding that the drainage of the tennis court is the responsibility of the owners and that 8 9 they are undertaking to satisfy that responsibility on 10 their own at their own expense. So, I -- I don't see that has much bearing on our -- on our application. 11 12 The fence is ten feet high. I measured it myself and it is our proposal that the existing fence 13 14 is to remain and basically will conceal our one-story 15 addition which is about ten feet high. So, the only 16 thing sticking above it will be the addition. 17 The very nice vine that Ms. Friendly 18 19 alluded is a porcelain berry vine that comes from the 20 Stettinius property as well. 21 The ANC said and made a point of remarking 22 when the issue of growing plants on the tennis court, 23 that given the size of the court and the size of the 24 property, they thought that the owners of the tennis 25 court should be able to find a way to grow vines on

	275
1	their own property and not rely on their neighbors for
2	ivy to cover the fence.
3	
4	The issues of the foundation can be
5	addressed. We we have engineers and hydrologists
6	so that we can deal successfully with the issue of the
7	foundation and keep the existing fence in place.
8	According to Mr. Stettinius, the the
9	this issue of the the impact on the height of the
10	two-story addition affecting the not allowing the
11	court to dry out, a simply solution might be to water
12	it less. Apparently, it gets watered every morning.
13	That that would be my my offer to that, a
14	solution.
15	According to Mr. Stettinius, the wind
16	blows from the southwest and not from the southeast.
17	So, in theory, our addition would not affect the air
18	movement over the tennis court.
19	I, too I'll jump in the jump in the
20	jump in the game here. I'm an avid tennis player.
21	I watch the U.S. Open. I saw lots of people playing
22	in sun. I saw people playing in shade and I saw
23	people playing in both.
24	I don't think that additional shade on the
25	tennis court adversely impacts the ability of someone

reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	1	to enjoy playing tennis. Somebody mentioned to be
and finally, the the issue of privacy with respect to the tennis court, I I think we can deal with that if we haven't dealt with it enough. We can eliminate all the windows. As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	2	able to hit a ball against the wall. That's a
And finally, the the issue of privacy with respect to the tennis court, I I think we can deal with that if we haven't dealt with it enough. We can eliminate all the windows. As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	3	that's an added attraction. I think the Stettinius
with respect to the tennis court, I I think we can deal with that if we haven't dealt with it enough. We can eliminate all the windows. As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	4	might be agreeable to that.
deal with that if we haven't dealt with it enough. We can eliminate all the windows. As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	5	And finally, the the issue of privacy
As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	6	with respect to the tennis court, I I think we can
As the Office of Planning pointed out in their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	7	deal with that if we haven't dealt with it enough. We
their report, they we have already effectively reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	8	can eliminate all the windows.
reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	9	As the Office of Planning pointed out in
by reducing the net number of windows that currently overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	LO	their report, they we have already effectively
overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L1	reduced increased the privacy on the tennis court
that part of the of the standard. And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L2	by reducing the net number of windows that currently
And that's that's all I have to say in terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L3	overlook it. I I think we're we're adhering to
terms of rebuttal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L4	that part of the of the standard.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L5	And that's that's all I have to say in
this out to know what foundation it is going to be? MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L6	terms of rebuttal.
MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have you detailed
far. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L8	this out to know what foundation it is going to be?
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	L9	MR. HORSEY: No, we have not gotten that
MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	20	far.
actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do with the matter of right.	21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
with the matter of right.	22	MR. HORSEY: We have conceptual
	23	actually, I do have one rebuttal issue which has to do
While while we while we haven't	24	with the matter of right.
	25	While while we while we haven't

investigated in any significant way the drawings, it's pretty clear, first of all, that we have an unusual site. We had mentioned that -- we have an unusual site. About 23 percent of our open space doglegs down to Avon Place. It's basically un-buildable.

We have -- Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel live right now door. An addition to the back would obviously impact them in a much greater way that any impact to this house or the tennis court and similarly, an addition to the front would also impact them and possibly the neighbors across the street in addition to causing more construction and possibly eliminating the use of the garage.

So, in terms of pursuing matter of right, as you said, the regulations don't require that.

And finally, I -- I would like to quote too from case number 840 which established these which in the -- in the notes in that transcript that -- provided by the Office of Planning, it actually specifically says and I quote "For example" -- this is in regards to a side yard requirement, whether it should be done by percentage or -- or not and it says quote "For example, in an R-1 zoned district with an eight-foot side yard requirement, a deviation may have a sound basis at zero side yard depending on the

1 character of the abutting lot." 2 So, it's clear that that was at least 3 something that was contemplated and I would argue that 4 -- that this is a legitimate case where the next house 5 next door is 120 feet away. So, that's the end of my rebuttal. 6 7 have a closing statement. 8 Do you have anymore questions? 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What would you 10 say the sound basis here is? 11 MR. HORSEY: I'm sorry. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think you made reference to a statement in the legislative history 13 14 about a sound basis for deviating from the eight-foot 15 side yard. I would say that the fact 16 MR. HORSEY: that the main house next door which I think is the 17 primary intent of the zoning regulations to -- to 18 19 provide privacy is 120 feet away and the impact on the 20 tennis court on four players as we've discussed here 21 is -- is, in my opinion, not great. I just don't see 22 what would -- how people would not be able to enjoy 23 the use of the tennis court to the full extent they do 24 now if it has a wall that's ten feet higher than --

than what the fence is now. Especially when they have

1	walls of similar heights at the other end of the
2	tennis court where they've been playing for for
3	many years.
4	
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And one other
6	thing came up, a question about the gutters or
7	something and how
8	MR. HORSEY: Yes, I'm sorry. Thank you
9	for raising that. The gutter we we can accommodate
LO	that and and Mr. Stettinius tells me that the
L1	tennis ball in the gutters and elsewhere are currently
L2	an issue and will continue to be an issue.
L3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, I mean the
L4	water.
L5	MR. HORSEY: And and pardon
L6	me?
L7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The water flow.
L8	MR. HORSEY: The water? Well, it's our
L9	obligation to not have any of our drainage go onto the
20	neighbor's property and we will fulfill that. We can
21	do it with in-board gutters. We can extend gutters to
22	the north and south of the two-story addition and
23	drain onto our own property.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
25	MEMBER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair, if I can guess

1 -- I just wanted to get some clarification and -- and 2 with regard to the existing fence and the -- the small brick wall that we've heard some reference to in -- in 3 4 the opposing party's testimony, what -- what is your 5 plan for -- for that -- that fence? First of all, is that -- is that considered on the applicant's subject 6 7 property? 8 MR. HORSEY: There is a wall. The question as seen from Mr. Stettinius side -- there's 9 10 -- there's certainly concrete block or cinder block here with -- with -- there. You know, I'm not sure 11 what it's made of. Get back down there, I'm going to 12 have to look at it. 13 14 It is our intent to retain the existing. 15 Ιf incorporate that wall into have to 16 structure, we'll do that. We want to maintain the 17 existing fence and I -- I don't have the structural detail that will enable us to do that right now, but 18 19 I'm confident that we can get it. 20 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you. Thank you, 21 Mr. Chair. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 22 Sorry. I iust 23 want to clarify on this wall. How many feet off your 24 property is it or onto their property is it? I mean

you're going to built to the property line if this

1 special exception approved and then is there going to 2 be any space between that and -- and this fence or no? 3 MR. HORSEY: In theory, not. If the Board 4 would like to grant us the allowance to create an 5 illegal court so that we can set our wall back so as 6 to better accommodate that wall to give us that 7 flexibility, that might -- which is, in fact, if we 8 pulled our wall -- our new wall an inch -- even an 9 inch off the property line, it would in theory be an 10 illegal court. So, we couldn't do that. We have to either set back six feet or go right up to the 11 12 property line. We feel confident we can go right up to 13 14 property line. The -- the -- from my -- we haven't 15 had it completely surveyed, but from my preliminary 16 measurements, the fence posts are on the Friendly 17 property. The wall straddles the property line. So, the fence can remain. The wall will 18 19 either be partially disassembled and -- and somehow 20 incorporated into new construction or incorporated 21 into new construction in its entirety so that the 22 fence can remain. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So -- so, we don't -- the Board doesn't have to forward an 24 25 from application for variance the court

1	requirements, but
2	MR. HORSEY: Okay. Well, that's
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: it what
4	I just am just following up. How much space would you
5	anticipate or do you think would yes, would you
6	seek?
7	MR. HORSEY: We're talking a matter of
8	inches.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Inches. Okay.
10	MR. HORSEY: Yes, two/three. I'm not
11	sure.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
13	MR. HORSEY: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else? In
15	looking at the design and anticipating the detailing
16	and and the structural foundation, you'd you'd
17	obviously be excavating adjacent to the tennis court.
18	Correct?
19	MR. HORSEY: Correct. Well, for
20	foundations, there's only one one portion of the
21	addition that goes down to the basement level. We
22	just need the staircase. They don't have a basement
23	planned. This is the basement level. All of which
24	is, you know
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, there's one

1 small portion that goes below. 2 MR. HORSEY: Right. This would go down to 3 the basement. This would be on a crawl space and this 4 -- this is also on a crawl space or a slab on grade. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Would -- would -would -- does the opening of that allow for -- with 6 7 the consensus of the adjacent property allow for some 8 sort of a below grade tile drainage or some perimeter 9 drainage? 10 MR. HORSEY: I think so. Sure. And -and another part of this almost agreement or whatever 11 12 we want to agree to it being was that the Friendlys would be indemnified by the Stettinius for any -- any 13 14 water going into their property which the Stettinius 15 were happy to accommodate and agree to. I think we can find a drainage system to 16 17 carry any subsurface drainage. The -- the natural flow of water is across. Is from -- is from the west 18 19 to the east and so, some will inevitably move across 20 the property line. It probably is exacerbated by --21 by the watering of the tennis court, but it would 22 probably occur naturally anyway. But, I --23 confident we can put some sort of drainage system in 24 to accommodate it.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS:

25

Any last

Okay.

remarks? Sounds so dire.

MR. HORSEY: Well, I just have very quickly, we've heard a lot about -- about what happened on the property next door and it's all been good and I think we can agree that -- that the Friendlys' stewardship of that property has -- has a been a good thing for Georgetown.

What -- what -- what we're here today to evaluate is really the project that we're proposing in terms of the specific criteria established by Section 223 and I without -- I won't go through it all again, but it's my opinion that we have met the requirements of these standards and the Office of Planning agrees with us. ANC-2E unanimously agreed with us. The Old Georgetown Board and the Commission of Fine Arts and Historic Preservation Division have agreed that our design is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and all the adjacent owners -- initially all of them, now all except one adjacent and abutting owners also agree with us.

So, I would ask for your approval of our application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.

Board Members, I think with the lateness of the hour

let's set this for a decision and as I pull out the

1 schedule, I think we would -- I would think -- where 2 I think we should set this for the fourth, our already 3 scheduled public meeting. 4 MS. GIORDANO: Excuse me. In view of the 5 fact that the Board isn't going to make a decision today, can we submit a rebuttal to the final remarks. 6 7 Can the record be left open for a few days for that 8 purpose? 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't know. What 10 do you guys think? Do we need additional information on this? 11 MEMBER 12 ETHERLY: Т Т have no opposition, Mr. Chair. I might be inclined to suggest 13 14 keep it as tight and as focused as possible. 15 I was going to request some additional information and maybe they could just be rolled into 16 what -- what the party in opposition is suggesting. 17 I would like to see some additional information on 18 19 what measures are already underway with regard to 20 drainage or -- or shall we say water mitigation that 21 might -- that might already be undertaken by the party 22 in opposition. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I -- I would 24 like to leave it open for what they might want to

I would welcome, you know, if there's time

address.

1	any further filings that you if you want in light
2	of any issues that were raised today at the hearing
3	that might not adequately have been addressed.
4	MR. HORSEY: Mr. Chairman.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
6	MR. HORSEY: If if there is new
7	information and and I would like a chance to
8	respond to it in due course. Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm looking at dates
LO	in February to try and decide this.
L1	MR. HORSEY: We obviously would like to
L2	move ahead with this. We have accommodated them.
L3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And this analogy is
L4	a bit too much for the volley back of responses on
L5	this one.
L6	Very well. It's come to light that the
L7	4th is probably a day that we will not want to
L8	schedule a lot of decision makings and additional
L9	hearings. So, I'm going to ask if there's any
20	difficulty with setting this for a special public
21	meeting on the 11th of October.
22	Do you see any difficulty in that
23	schedule, Mr. Horsey?
24	MR. HORSEY: I think so.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Ms. Giordano,

1	any objection to that?
2	Very well. Then let's let's look at
3	additional information that's been requested.
4	First of all, Mr. Etherly is requesting,
5	Ms. Giordano, of of your client a submission of
6	what is the drainage or mitigating construction that's
7	happening to date or anticipated.
8	We'll keep the record open well, I
9	think additionally then what we would have is what was
LO	you had brought up in evidence a letter that was
L1	indicated that there might be some shared
L2	responsibility or responsibility for water flow and
L3	drainage.
L4	MR. HORSEY: That was submitted.
L5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is it and it's
L6	it's detailed what what that level of mitigation
L7	would be?
L8	MR. HORSEY: No, it doesn't, but we
L9	actually did Mr. Stettinius and I did meet with a
20	civil engineer prior to making that commitment to
21	figure out how that could be done.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. I will
23	keep the record open in in in response to what
24	Mr. Etherly is asking on one side. To also have the

record open for you to submit what was anticipated in

1	in that
2	MR. HORSEY: Right.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: in that agreement
4	even though
5	MR. HORSEY: But, that is no longer.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: we understand
7	that it may not be finalized.
8	MR. HORSEY: Right and and that that
9	is no longer on the table as it were.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Right.
11	MR. HORSEY: Due due to their
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
13	MR. HORSEY: withdrawal.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And you can
15	clarify that in your submission if you'd like to do
16	that.
17	MR. HORSEY: Right.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Other than
19	that then there's a request from Ms. Giordano for
20	rebuttal to the closing remarks of which we'll need
21	then in by I'd say a week and then responses to that.
22	I don't think we're looking for draft conclusions on
23	this one.
24	Anything else?
25	MR. HORSEY: So, what could you clarify

1	the date for additional
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Absolutely. Any
3	other information?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I'm not
5	I'm not asking for this, but I I I would welcome
6	if the parties have anything more to say about the
7	legislative history and the intent of the special
8	exception regulation, but that that could be
9	addressed if there's anything more to say.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You're asking the
11	legal counsel if there's anything more to say?
12	Excellent. Excellent.
13	Okay. Why don't we have that all in at
14	the same time then under one submission for the
15	parties in opposition. Ms. Giordano, is there any
16	difficulty in having that done within a week, by
17	Friday next at 3:00? No difficulty there?
18	MS. GIORDANO: A week from this Friday?
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. A week from
20	this Friday. I think that gives us ample amount of
21	time. That puts us on the does it? Yes, it does.
22	That's what's the date, Ms. Bailey?
23	MS. BAILEY: The 23rd of September, Mr.
24	Chairman.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, that would be

1 the 23rd which gives ample time for a week response to 2 that information that's submitted and also to put in 3 your additional information. 4 Obviously, all of this is going to be 5 You're all very familiar with that and then we would hear this as a special public meeting at 9:30 6 7 on the 11th of October. I'll reiterate all these dates or Ms. 8 Bailey actually will walk this down. 9 But, let me give some direction. 10 11 Miller and she's well stated in asking for Ms. 12 legislative history on Section 223 and some Board Members are very well aware of it. I don't think that 13 14 this case necessarily, I haven't been persuaded, would rise and fall based on the intent of Section 223. 15 I think we've gone through enough special 16 17 exceptions to understand why it was done. In fact, it was as Mr. Gross actually mentioned somewhat of an 18 19 impetus of this Board in hearing so many variances of things that did not seem to rise to that level. 2.0 21 Any additional information in background, 22 I think is appropriate, but I quess that's my direct direction. 23 Is that is -- let's tie it -- tie it 24 specifically to how it's going impact and inform the

-- the deliberation on this case.

1	Okay. Anything else?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to
3	say I'm not I wasn't exactly asking for it. I
4	I think it's just an issue that was raised and it
5	it could be addressed if they wanted to, if they had
6	more to say.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. But, the
8	record's open it or it isn't. So, there it is. It's
9	open. Obviously, you can avail yourselves if if
LO	needed.
L1	Okay. Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind.
L2	MS. BAILEY: The submissions are to come
L3	in by September 23rd, Mr. Chairman. That's the day
L4	that I have and then the responses that would be the
L5	following Friday which would be the 30th of September.
L6	Is that appropriate? And
L7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. What day is
L8	that, Ms. Bailey?
L9	MS. BAILEY: The the response is
20	September 30th.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The day of the week?
22	MS. BAILEY: A week from the 23rd.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay.
24	MS. BAILEY: And then the decision will be
25	is scheduled for October the 11th at Board's

1	morning session which is the public meeting.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent.
3	Everybody clear. Yes.
4	MR. HORSEY: I'm not 100 percent clear.
5	So, by the 23rd, the opposition has to file their
6	additional information and then by the 30th, I file
7	mine. Is that correct?
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's correct.
9	MR. HORSEY: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Anything else
11	procedural? Nothing else. Very well. Thank you all
12	very much.
13	MR. HORSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Appreciate your
15	stamina and let us move on to the next case in the
16	afternoon.
17	Let me also just mention while right
18	before we get in. We do have additional photographs,
19	Mr. Horsey, that you showed that weren't in the
20	record. So, you're going to make copies of that and
21	also submit those. Is that correct?
22	MR. HORSEY: I have those here.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So, you'll
24	leave those today and they'll go into the record.
25	Excellent.

1	Okay. Let's move ahead then.
2	MS. BAILEY: Application number 17349 of
3	Michael Taylor and it's pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for
4	a special exception to allow a rare addition to an
5	existing single-family detached dwelling under Section
6	223 not meeting the lot occupancy requirements at
7	Section 403, side yard requirement Section 405, non-
8	conforming structural provisions Subsection 2001.3.
9	The property is located at 6919 6th
10	Street, N.W. It's also known as square 3191, lots 19
11	and 811 and the property is zoned R-B.
12	Mr. Taylor.
13	MR. TAYLOR: Yes, ma'am.
14	MS. BAILEY: Would you please have a seat
15	at the table.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. In our
17	past calling of this case, we had established the
18	party in opposition. Ms. Ferster is representing
19	Friends and Neighbors of Square 3191. Is that what
20	MS. FERSTER: That's correct.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay and you've also
22	brought a motion to dismiss and there is an opposition
23	to the motion to dismiss.
24	Very well. We're going to give as
25	there is I don't know why.

Give you an opportunity to quickly address the motion.

MS. FERSTER: Okay. Thank you. Just to give you a little bit of background, this matter did come up on July 12th. The applicant requested to postpone the hearing based on the absence of a topographical site survey that the Office of Planning had requested.

The applicant did promise to get that site survey in within a week and the matter was postponed over the objections of Friends and Neighbors of Square 3191.

We filed our motion on Friday at -- in the morning. I have the stamped copy.

We waited until two weeks before the hearing because we assumed -- we -- we wanted to make sure that the material -- even though we had expected it to come in July, it didn't come in in the two weeks prior to this -- this scheduled date. It did not come in. We waited even an additional week and finally, on Friday, September 9th since we did not have this material that had been deemed important enough to postpone the hearing last time around, we filed a motion to dismiss based on the absence of this -- this material.

On Monday, the applicant did file an opposition along with a typographic -- topographical site plan and a series of selected photographs and they're asking for a waiver of the rules in order to allow this material to be submitted now.

We -- we understand that the Office of Planning, however, still in the same position that it was back in July as -- of not being able to provide a report on this addition because of the absence of this information in a timely fashion.

We feel that the applicant has been given enough time already at a great inconvenience and -- to the neighbors who had all assembled on July 12th and were ready to present their case in opposition. A postponement was granted based on the promise that this material would be given -- provided in a week and yet, you know, two months later, we don't get the material until the day before the hearing. So, we don't feel that the opposition states any good cause for the failure to provide this information within two weeks of the scheduled hearing.

This information obviously is a very important part of the applicant's prima facie case because the rules explicitly require graphical representations of the addition and it just isn't in

2 in the record until yesterday. 3 The other point I wanted to make also is 4 that this is -- this addition is in a somewhat 5 different position than an un-built addition because it has been framed and it does exist. 6 So, it is 7 possible to actually view what the -- the visibility 8 this addition from the adjacent property --9 properties and to have a good picture of the impacts 10 on the adjacent properties in terms of light and air and privacy as well as the impacts from the street. 11 12 And based on -- and I'm going to read from the report of the Office of Planning. The Office of 13 14 Planning did go and visit the property I believe back 15 in July and clearly said "The proposed addition towers the rear and side yards of the adjacent 16 17 properties and is viewed as three stories." 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. We're getting 19 beyond the motion. Aren't we? 20 MS. FERSTER: Well, I mean my --21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me clarify the 22 question. 23 MS. FERSTER: -- point is I don't think 24 you need to take any evidence in this case. This --25 that even if you waive your rules, which we don't

the record without a waiver of the rules and it wasn't

1 think you should do in order to accept the applicant's 2 late material, I don't think they have made a case for demonstrating that their addition is of a size, scale 3 4 and character that does not impair the privacy, light 5 and air or --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, isn't that the 6 7 whole point of a public hearing? How could we come in 8 and preempt and -- and deny an application saying we 9 clearly see it's not going to be successful when we 10 set forth a public hearing in order to continue with the evidentiary hearing? 11 Well, our position is they 12 MS. FERSTER: had plenty of time to make this case, to provide the 13 14 information that would have made this case before --15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, now's the time 16 to make the case. 17 MS. FERSTER: -- and they didn't do it. They had --18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, they didn't submit the -- they didn't submit the requested 20 21 information, but they haven't begun to make their 22 Have they? case. 23 MS. FERSTER: Well, your rules do require that this material be submitted two weeks before the 24 25 hearing and it is an essential element of their case.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which regulation?
2	MS. FERSTER: We so excuse me?
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which regulation are
4	you citing for the two weeks?
5	MS. FERSTER: Regulation 223 requires the
6	applicant to present graphical representations as part
7	of their their case and
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
9	MS. FERSTER: and your other your
10	procedural rules of procedure require that material
11	to be submitted two weeks prior to a hearing.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The prehearing
13	submission would be two weeks?
14	MS. FERSTER: That's correct. So, our
15	position is that the applicant has had ample
16	opportunities to submit this material.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
18	MS. FERSTER: And they didn't do so and
19	now they they have submitted some material the day
20	before the hearing and and at this point, they
21	you know, it's too late. They they had their
22	opportunity. They have not shown any good cause for
23	for for this late submission. So, we think the
24	application should be dismissed.
25	The Friends and Neighbors who are all

1	coming down to this hearing for a second time have
2	been you know, obviously, this is their second time
3	all coming down here to come to a hearing on an issue
4	when they have not been given the material that
5	apparently the applicant intends to rely on until the
6	day before the hearing.
7	And we don't have the Office of Planning
8	report either. I mean I don't.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. So, isn't it
10	in some sense that the effect of this the the
11	the timing of this submission, doesn't that change
12	your motion for another motion to continue this so you
13	have ample time to review this and address it and
14	allow Office of Planning to do the same?
15	MS. FERSTER: No, because my clients again
16	are opposed to any continuance because again, they're
17	they're dealing with a a framed existing
18	addition in their backyards. It's an eyesore.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
20	MS. FERSTER: And they want this matter
21	resolved.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And and
23	and
24	MS. FERSTER: And preferably summarily
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: and you've also

don't think that this would be persuasive anyway even 2 3 if it was utilized and we --4 MS. FERSTER: We -- we don't. We've 5 looked at their -- reviewed the photographs that have been submitted with the -- the topographical site 6 7 analysis. First of all, the topographical site 8 analysis doesn't even show the topography of the 9 properties on Cedar Street. So, already, we've got 10 several impacted properties that there's no topographical information on in the site analysis. 11 Ιt 12 just shows some of the properties on 5th Street and we have alleged in our request for party status very 13 specific views of properties on Cedar Street, on 14 15 Butternut Street and on --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, you don't think 16 17 there's a lot of value even at looking at this submitted topographic survey? 18 19 MS. FERSTER: So, we don't think that this 20 topographical survey is adequate. No, we don't think 21 it -- it satisfies their application. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. But, doesn't 23 that go to the opposition's motion to dismiss. 24 Doesn't it -- they also agree with you and say this 25 isn't critical to their case?

made the statement that -- to the effect that you

MS. FERSTER: I'm -- I'm not sure what -- what -- whether it's critical or not, but it certainly, to the extent that the Office of Planning felt that it was necessary, it's still adequate and it was the basis for a continuing it before.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. FERSTER: Also, the photographs that they've submitted are also we don't feel an adequate graphical representation to satisfy their obligations under the rules.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. But, clearly, that would be something that we'd have to decide and we'd have to hear both sides. It's certainly not taken up in a motion to dismiss that you feel that it's inadequate representation.

Let's take other questions. Ms. Miller.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I was out of the room, I'm sorry, for the beginning of your presentation, but I've read your motion to dismiss and I -- I've heard what you've just said now, but I -- I'm not clear exactly on your position. I understand you're seeking dismissal. Now, if -- because of certain things such as the study wasn't submitted within 14 days of the hearing, if -- if the -- if your motion is denied, is your position that you're ready

1 to go forward today or do you need more time in that 2 the -- the -- the submissions weren't 14 -- submitted within 14 days of the hearing? 3 4 MS. FERSTER: If you deny our motion and 5 waive the rules in order to allow this material to 6 come in, we are ready to do forward with our 7 opposition case today. 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank 9 you. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else? MR. FARMER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the 11 12 Board, I'm -- I'm John Farmer in appearance for Mr. Taylor in this particular matter. I'm the one who 13 14 filed the opposition to the motion to dismiss. 15 While I apologize for the lateness of the information, the information was not received until 16 17 last Friday, the 9th and as -- as we said, Mr. Nunley previously had -- had ordered that information. 18 19 indicated to the Board that it would -- it would be 20 occurring, but again, the -- the engineer did have 21 some difficulty apparently, first of all, entering all 22 the properties on -- on the square. Second of all, 23 being able to produce the information in a timely 24 basis. 25 As the Chairman has noted, we don't know

that this is or we don't think that this is critical
to the decision of of the special exception case in
this particular matter. The situation has been well
known. The rules and regulations under Section 223
don't specifically require topographical information.
Just graphical information. We have plans in the
records. We have photos we have photographs in the
in the record which we think adequately depict the
site and and what has actually been built.
This case is in a somewhat different
posture because while my understanding is at the last
hearing the Chair ruled that this would be treated as
as a as a new application, the structure does
stand and it does stand in a in a particular form
and in a particular location.
Given that, we don't feel that this
prejudices the opposition the opposition's case in
anyway.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well.
Clarifications? Questions? Is the Board ready to
move on the the motion to dismiss?
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just want to
raise a question. I thought that the Office of
Planning had stated that they needed this information.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: They did indeed and

б

1 that's one of the main reasons why there's 2 Even with the party in opposition postponement. opposing the continuance, they were ready to 3 4 forward last. We did decide that it would be 5 advantageous to have all the information in. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do we have a 6 7 representative from the Office of Planning here? Everybody's in a different place here. 8 9 I guess if -- if the -- my question is to 10 Ms. Roberts. As -- was this provided to you in time for you to be able to make a recommendation today and 11 12 -- and have it, you know, and have us go forward 13 today? MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I received the package 14 15 yesterday evening at 5:00. So, I was not able to -to do a proper review. I don't think I was in the --16 I was able to -- to look at what was submitted and to 17 see if what I had requested was also submitted and --18 19 and I don't think that was done and so, I was not 20 prepared to -- to -- I'm not prepared to go ahead to 21 make a recommendation today. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 22 And I quess my 23 follow-up question would be if we did go forward today 24 is this something that you feel that you comfortably

could address in a supplemental report?

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: From just taking a preliminary look at what was given to me, I think that I would want to -- I still have some questions that I think wasn't addressed. So, yes, it could be -- it could be addressed as a preliminary report. Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a motion to dismiss this case and based on the testimony and arguments we've heard today, I would move to deny the motion to dismiss.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Second.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't think that that the -- speaking to the motion, I don't think that the arguments that were articulated today rise to the level of -- of grounds for dismissal. They seem to be based on information that was provided late, but the parties have indicated that they can go forward regardless. So, I just don't see grounds for a dismissal.

and just being brief to the motion, I do think that to be so severe as to approve a motion to dismiss based on the lack of information or the projected unpersuasiveness of a case prior to it actually being heard is not the appropriate procedure for this Board

1	to take.
2	So, let me ask if there's any other
3	deliberation, comments on the motion before us?
4	We have a motion. It's been seconded.
5	The motion is to deny the motion to dismiss. I would
6	ask for all in favor signify by saying aye.
7	(Ayes.)
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed?
9	Abstaining? Very well. We'll record that vote.
LO	MS. BAILEY: The vote is recorded as 4-0-1
L1	not to to deny the motion to deny the motion to
L2	dismiss the application. Mr Ms. Miller made the
L3	motion. Mr. Griffis second. Mr. Mann and Mr.
L4	Etherly's in agreement and there's not a Zoning
L5	Commission Member present.
L6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank
L7	you very much.
L8	In order to proceed and I think we should
L9	utilize a little bit of the time that we have tonight
20	or I should say the little time we have tonight, I
21	want to move right ahead and have the case
22	presentation made. I'm going to get to the point of
23	full presentation of the case to cross examination.
24	Then I'd like to assess how many people

are here present today that were here to give persons

-- to -- to provide testimony and I think we can get 1 2 to that level. 3 That will take a little bit out of order 4 and then we can assess where we are in terms of time and may set another date. 5 That would mean that everyone that was here to provide testimony might not 6 7 have to come back again. Let's get through as much as 8 possible this evening. I think we would obviously keep the record 9 10 open for a supplemental report or a report from the 11 Office of Planning and so, I'm not sure that we'd 12 actually even be able to finish tonight. I know we won't unless just disregard, in 13 we 14 submission of the Office of Planning's report. 15 That being said, let's move ahead to case 16 presentation. If -- I -- I probably was 17 MS. FERSTER: not in the room when you said this, but how late did 18 19 you say that you were planning on going tonight? 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good and I didn't 21 give actually, for time on it but just 22 clarification, well, do you know approximately how 23 long you need for your case presentation? MR. FARMER: I would estimate about half 24 25 an hour to 45 minutes.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. Okay. So,
2	we have that with the Board questions and cross
3	examination.
4	Then I would if people are amenable
5	that want to give testimony tonight, we could go to
6	persons present to give testimony and that would be
7	three minutes each.
8	So, I think we're looking at another hour,
9	hour 15, hour and 30 minutes.
LO	MR. FARMER: Mr. Chairman.
L1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
L2	MR. FARMER: We would not object to a
L3	delay if that if that would convenience the other
L4	the other side. Otherwise, we're prepared to go
L5	forward.
L6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm sorry. I didn't
L7	catch
L8	MR. FARMER: I said we would not object to
L9	a delay if you want to hear the whole of the case at
20	another time. We we would not object. However, we
21	are prepared to go forward at this at this time if
22	it if it is more convenient for the opposition.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: If that's what
24	you're saying, let let's take 30 seconds and assess
25	that. I mean we've been here since 8:00 this morning.

1	MR. FARMER: I I understand.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And I'm sweating
3	like I've never done before. So
4	MR. FARMER: I'd like I'd like to take
5	off my coat as well.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'd be fine to go
7	and take a shower, but I'm I think the Board is
8	prepared to stay to utilize, you know, as little time
9	as we have this evening. Yes.
10	MS. FERSTER: Well, of course, our
11	position is we'd like the whole case to be heard
12	tonight. If that's not possible, then I think we can
13	discuss another date that would be more convenient,
14	but our preference would be to hear the whole case and
15	I know it's not air conditioned in here. So
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
17	MS. FERSTER: I think that's pretty
18	unlikely that that's going to happen.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, and the
20	option, I I don't see anyway we'd hear it all
21	tonight. Just unless we have the the record left
22	open. But, with the opportunity that we have, what is
23	your preference? Is it to hear portions of it
24	tonight? To utilize another hour and a half or so or
25	to set a whole new date?

1 MS. FERSTER: Let me -- let -- let me confer with my clients and I guess one -- one question 2 is setting a new date. What -- what are -- what are 3 4 the new dates? 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's aooq а question. That's what I'm going to figure out while 6 7 you're talking. Looks like the -- the clearest time where 8 we wouldn't have hopefully another situation like 9 today would be the first case in the afternoon on the 10 11 24th of October. Twenty-fifth rather. I'm sorry. 12 MS. FERSTER: Is that okay? Okay. We -we have a couple of comments on that. 13 14 One is that I think they -- they are 15 vetting the dates and I think that -- that date is 16 looking okay, but the -- one issue that we have wanted to raise is that the Office of Planning has said that 17 they don't -- still don't have the information that 18 19 they want to have and we don't want to be in a 20 position -- this same position again on October 24th with some additional information coming in and -- and 21 22 no opportunity to respond to it. 23 So, we request that the record be closed and that there be no further submissions so we're not 24

in this situation of information trickling in at the

1	last minute and not and postponement requests based
2	on that, you know, that that lack of information.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But, that's two
4	points and you're saying that Office of Planning still
5	doesn't have information they need, but you want us to
6	close the record.
7	MS. FERSTER: It it well, we'd like
8	to have the Office of Planning's report.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. That will be
10	hard to do if they can't get the information though.
11	Do you need additional information to do
12	your report?
13	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, but I I think
14	that I can meet with the applicant sometime maybe this
15	week.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
17	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: And so to explain to
18	them what is it I need and hopefully, they'll have a
19	quick turnaround.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes.
21	MR. FARMER: We have no objection to that.
22	I would raise the point if what we need is a complete
23	what is going to be requested is a complete
24	topographical survey of that square, we'll need the
25	cooperation of the homeowners in that square.

	5-2
1	My understanding is that some of the
2	owners did deny the surveyor an opportunity.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is that your
4	anticipation to ask for a topographic survey of the
5	square? Of the entire square?
6	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Maybe not the entire
7	square, but there are two adjacent properties. I
8	I think from my preliminary analysis that we need to
9	get some information to show the relationship.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Couldn't Office of
11	Planning generate that? Let me think of a case.
12	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: There there is a
13	house on this side that we have some concern about and
14	right here. I think those are the two that are most
15	impacted.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I mean you're
17	looking for just to see how the the grade
18	changes
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: and the
21	relationship.
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean you don't
24	need actually a an alta or a civil survey.
25	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Oh, no. No. No.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So and so, I'm
2	serious in that we have the Arcato and the GIS that
3	actually Office of Planning generates maps of. Isn't
4	is is that the level of detail you're looking at
5	in terms of your
6	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: I I can take a look
7	at I think I would like to to take a look at
8	that and then let the applicant know. I think that is
9	something that we can work out
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
11	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: amongst ourselves.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. All right.
13	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean as far as my
15	familiarity is that might well be
16	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: May be enough.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: the on the
18	past Office of Planning's report we had.
19	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: An excellent
21	relationship map.
22	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It shows the
24	building footprints and the topography.
25	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, we can we can

1	try that.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
3	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: You know, willing to
4	to to do that.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. All right.
6	So, I think that's a a viable solution. Anything
7	else then that you would anticipate needing or
8	requiring or is that just stuff that will come up in
9	discussion?
10	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: It it's I think
11	it's just stuff that will come up
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
13	MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: in in talking.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So, in that case,
15	Ms. Ferster, I don't see any other anticipation of
16	any other information. Certainly, the Board's not
17	requesting.
18	Do you have any anticipation of additional
19	submissions into the record?
20	MR. FARMER: Only the information as as
21	required by the Office of Planning.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And so, what
23	we're going to do is we're going to treat that as
24	as the agency's communication with you. They'll be
25	forthcoming with there report of anything and they can

1 bring into the record at that time if there's 2 additional information that isn't part of the general 3 knowledge, but I don't anticipate at this point there 4 would be substantial additional information. And then we'd look for the Office of 5 Planning's report to be put in the record as soon as 6 7 it's generated. As much ahead of time of the 25th as 8 possible would be appreciated. 9 MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes, will be. Yes. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Certainly, like it a week before so the Board can get it and actually 11 12 read it. MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Right. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which would -- we'll 15 get to that date. Okay. Anything else then? 16 MS. FERSTER: Yes, I would state for the 17 record that my clients denied nobody access to their 18 19 property when the surveyor came on the property on 20 August 25th which was the date the surveyor was there. 21 I might add, you know, quite recently. So, this --22 that's not an issue here. Nobody have been denying 23 the surveyors access to their property. 24 Perhaps somebody was not home when the 25 surveyor knocked on it -- one person's door,

1	
1	nobody all my clients who were home at the time
2	allowed the surveyors unto their property.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything
4	else?
5	
6	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
8	MS. BAILEY: October 25th. When is this
9	case schedule for the morning or afternoon session?
LO	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I was looking at the
L1	first case in the afternoon. Well, I don't think so.
L2	Okay. Sorry. Thought we had a a closer date, but
L3	it doesn't look like that's going to work. Okay.
L4	Procedurally, everyone understanding what
L5	we're going to do then?
L6	What's going to happen with the Office of
L7	Planning? The Office of Planning's going to get their
L8	report in a week before if not sooner into the record.
L9	That will be is there I would request that
20	that that's just served on Ms. Ferster as well as the
21	applicant. We can provide copies to everyone so that
22	we all have them timely. When the Board gets it, you
23	will also get a copy of that.
24	That doesn't mean don't come checking,
25	call. Of course, Ms. Ferster's very and Mr. Nunley's

very aware of how to make sure and see what's in the
record and what isn't, but at this point, we have not
let the record open for any other additional
information and we'll look for the presentation of the
case and the case in opposition on the 25th then.
What other questions can I answer,
procedural submissions? I'm sorry. Yes, and then
that that is exactly what I meant. Forgot to say
it. We'd certainly have that done.
Okay. Anything else? Everyone all set
then. Understanding. Perfect.
Well, thank you all very much. I do
apologize for for taking up so much time and we
look forward to going ahead with this on the 25th.
I don't see any reason why we wouldn't.
Obviously, I can't predict everything that can happen,
but it seems like we will absolutely be ready to call
the case and move directly into it.
There it is. Thank you all very much.
Ms. Bailey, is there any other
information?
MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. In which
case, I can adjourn the afternoon hearing and hold for
a moment after an executive session that we may, in

1	fact, recall a public meeting for the Board	for
2	perhaps a brief decision. Okay.	
3	(Whereupon, the meeting and hearing	was
4	concluded at 6:13 p.m.)	
5		